THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Redhill Rectory, Rowlands Castle, Hants, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XX. MARCH, 1930 No. 117

EDITORIAL

The approach of Lent reminds us that fasting, as a religious observance, is of two distinguishable, though complementary, types, deriving from two different motives. On the one hand it is ascetic, a training in the control of the bodily appetites with a view to a more complete spiritual freedom; of such a kind would seem to have been our Lord's fast of forty days in the wilderness, and the fasts made by the primitive Church before great decisions were reached. The second type is rather affective than ascetic, and is connected with mourning or public sorrow. The principal Jewish fasts were of this kind; and our Lord seems to have had this type in mind, when He spoke of how His Church would fast when "the bridegroom" was removed. The regular need of the first kind would be disputed by none; nor would fasting as an expression of sorrow be ever out of place for those who love the crucifix as the emblem of One on whom was laid the iniquities of us all. And yet there are times in history when the need and meaning of this second type of fasting are brought home to us with especial force: and the present would seem to be one of them.

We need name only two causes why this is so. One lies in the fearful uprising of Antichrist which we are beholding in Russia, where a persecution, not of religious belief only but of every kind of righteousness, is proceeding on a scale without precedent in history. It falls naturally most severely upon the Christian Church in that vast country; it is Christ's own body, of which we ourselves are members, that is being tortured and torn. We need to feel their anguish as our own; and there is perhaps nothing which will so much help us in this as fasting for their sake and in sorrow for their sorrows. We cannot forget that God has allowed this fearful cataclysm, as He allowed similar cataclysms to overwhelm the Holy City more than once

in its long story; and it is His mighty arm, and His alone, that can avenge—as it has avenged before—His slaughtered people. Let our day of prayer for the Russian Church on March 16 spring from hearts that have been chastened by fasting into a pure and unselfish love of the brethren.

But there is also another sorrow that may well press upon us at this time, though it is not so vivid, nor so easy to define. It is sorrow for the condition of our own people. The palpable loss of public confidence throughout the world of industry, and the ever-mounting figures of unemployment, are symptoms of a deep-seated moral infirmity which statesmen are powerless to cure. What we need is not fresh social legislation, but fresh will-power, motive, vision. The widespread and sweeping assumption that war is in itself incompatible with the Christian profession has induced in the public a comfortable oblivion of the sacrifices by which its present security was won; and a system of doles, leading men to regard themselves rather as social pensioners than citizens, suggests that there is nothing in life which will call for effort or sacrifice today. The best hope of a remedy for this universal "accidie" lies in the initiative and enterprise of the Church. And there are signs that this initiative is not lacking. The Church Assembly's decision to seek for a new basis of partnership between Church and State; the vigorous and vigilant work for religious education in our schools which is being done by Churchmen on County Councils in many parts of the country; the successful experiment in the re-conditioning of slum property first launched by a priest of the Church of England, and now being widely copied elsewhere—these are some indications of the creativeness which is the Church's true reaction to popular disillusionment and lack of power. While we mourn in Lent, then, let us mourn in hope; for in our midst is He who is the Hope of all the ends of the earth.

THE MIND AND THE HEART—II

LET us endeavour to unfold the meaning of the two principles which we are seeking to understand by applying what has been said to the all-important question of conversion. Although it has been much studied, and many have written about it, I think that many are still in a state of some mental confusion concerning it. Two conclusions seem to follow from our two laws or principles:

(*a*) Conversion must involve the unification of the Heart.

(*b*) It must also involve contact with reality through the Mind.

The former of these processes has been much canvassed. Many discussions on the subject have presupposed that this is the whole of conversion. But this is to make a fatal mistake. For a high degree of unification can be reached along the wrong lines altogether. Any primary instinct, or instincts, which have created a powerful sentiment can achieve unification. For example, it can be achieved along the lines of the instinct of self-assertion, or the instinct of acquisition. William James gives an interesting instance of the latter. A man who was the inheritor of a large estate had squandered his fortune. One day, in a state of penury, he sat on the brow of a hill, overlooking what had once been his property. He was suddenly seized with the idea of regaining what he had lost. He set to work immediately, earning anything he could, and rejecting no offer of work, however menial, the while he never spent a single penny if he could help it. He died an inveterate miser, worth £60,000.* The successful man of the world, whether he be politician, financier, soldier, scientist, or even man of letters, affords all the further proof that is required.

If, however, the unification is to be complete and lasting, a dominant sentiment is not sufficient. The mind must also make contact with truth and reality. Only too often, as we have seen, the place of the mind in this question is as rationalizer. That is to say, it comes in to justify an emotional experience without adding any increase of knowledge. This, for example, is the fundamental weakness of the Methodist theology of conversion, and the doctrine of assurance, great and glorious as was, and is, their insistence on the universal love and grace of God. The argument put bluntly ran: I feel saved, therefore I *am* saved. Of course, it does not follow. Still less can we argue, I do not feel saved, therefore I am not saved.

If we examine the account which Wesley has given us of the experience which he regarded as his conversion, we can

* *Cf.* also the "conversion" of Lucretius by Epicurus (*De Rerum Natura*, v. 8 *ff.*).

see clearly how inadequately that experience fulfilled the second of the two conditions which we have set down as necessary for a true conversion. About a quarter to nine in the evening, he tells us, he was listening to somebody reading from Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans, where the Reformer was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, when, says Wesley, "I felt my heart strangely warmed! I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the law of sin and death." Here we have a real unification of the Heart, but there appears to be no corresponding illumination of the Mind. It is difficult to say what knowledge Wesley had after this experience which was not his before. The truth would seem to be that if Wesley's conversion is to be placed at one moment at all, that moment took place thirteen years before when, under the influence of Miss Kirkham, he began to read Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation of Christ*. "I began to see," he writes in his journal, "that true religion was seated in the heart, and that God's *law* extended to all our thoughts as well as words and actions." Referring to this book and to Law's *Serious Call*, he says: "Although I was much offended at many parts of both, yet they convinced me more than ever of the exceeding height and breadth of the *law* of God. The light flowed in so mightily upon my soul that everything appeared in a new view." It is no accident that in this case he describes his experience in terms of light, whereas in the later experience he speaks only of feelings.

From this fault in Wesley's theology is derived the narrowness of the strict Methodist outlook, and the highly unsatisfactory nature of many of the Methodist "conversions." As typical of the latter, let me quote the case of a certain John Enser, who has described his condition fully in a letter to Wesley, a letter which happily has been preserved for us. He writes as follows:

"John Westly for I cannot use any apology neither rough nor smooth saving that for several reasons I choose to deliver my Horrid sentiments to you in writing. It is about 9 or 10 weeks ago since I received Justification or pardon applied to my Heart, the Lord being the Agent, your brother Charles the minister, att which time I was full of love to God and man, full of light in the Holy Scriptures, full of Joy in the Holy Ghost, full of Faith, full of Expectation of fresh Light, receiving many gracious promises, as, God careth for thee, whereby I was delivered from all my worldly cares, and walked on as though I had been walking in the air; insomuch that I thought work was done. I told your brother God had got full possession of

my Heart. Tis true he gave me a caution not to be too sure. And now I have cause enough to remember, for now the scene is quite altered: things has now another face: now all things are past away, behold all things are become old. But not indeed properly, for I never before felt such a Hell as I now feel. I now am as very a devil as ever was or will be confined in the Everlasting Chains of darkness. I now hate God, hate my Brother, hate my Children, hate all that is good, and what adds much to my sorrow in it, I know God and the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ Loves me. I am as proud as Lucifer, as covetous as mamon, as hateful as Belzeebub, and as Lustful. As for my wife, I take no more notice of her

Than I do of the Spiders Webb
Swept from the Wall by the Gidy Maid.

Dr Sir what shall I do in this condition ? I am just upon the point of breaking off from God, of declaring for the Devil. Therefore if you can help me by writing to me or talking with me you will be ever remembered by your poor and miserable and blind and naked felow creature, "JOHN ENSER."

When we turn from Methodism to the Gospels, it becomes clear at once that there is nothing in our Lord's life and work which corresponds to the methods of the Methodists. His "field preaching" was something quite different from that of Wesley and Whitfield. It was evidently designed to bring about a permanent contact with reality, rather than to achieve an immediate, and possibly superficial, unification of personality. Thus it was that He obviously attached less importance to His field preaching than He did to the more intensive work which He did with individuals or small groups. He definitely shunned crowds, and the excitement associated with them, at all times. And as the Ministry advances, we can see Him devoting more and more exclusive attention to the training of the Twelve. All this is a commonplace of New Testament study, but it is enormously significant from our present point of view, for it is impossible to "convert" a crowd in our sense of the former term. And it is, in fact, quite plain that in all His teaching, whether given to the Apostles alone or to the multitude, He had constant regard to the twofold nature of the process of conversion upon which we have been insisting. It is also clear that He recognized the existence of the two great laws of the Heart upon which we have laid emphasis.

Let us observe how He recognized the priority of the Heart. This is revealed by the fact that He seldom argues. He knew that "a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." And so it was that when, at the close of the Ministry,

the Pharisees press Him for His credentials, He puts to them the penetrating question: "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?" This was a question directed to their hearts, and not to their minds. It was designed to show whether their intention was pure. Until our Lord was satisfied on that point, He realized that it would be a sheer waste of time to attempt to appeal to their minds. In other words, He is acting upon the principle of the priority of the Heart. And this was what He always did. When, for example, He called His first disciples, He did not appeal in the first instance to their minds, but to their hearts. He made no statement of His claims. He simply said: "Follow Me, and I will make you fishers of men." He called them, that is to say, along the line of their interests. It was not until they had followed that their minds were illuminated.

There is a saying recorded in the Fourth Gospel which expresses the principle of the priority of the Heart in a nut-shell: "He that willeth to do the will shall know of the teaching." It is quite in a line with what we find in our Lord's teaching as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. There we find a continual insistence upon the conative aspect of the Heart—*i.e.*, upon doing—and there is a big bunch of parables designed to inculcate this lesson. Our Lord is not much impressed by a mere stirring of the feeling aspect of the Heart alone. He definitely rebukes those who are satisfied with this. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of God, but he that doeth the will of My father which is in heaven." "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." It is clear that persons who utter sentiments of this description are, in our sense of the term, literally "half-hearted." Hence they are found wanting.

In spite of our Lord's insistence upon the priority of the Heart, He never overlooks for a moment the essential function of the Mind. He constantly appeals to men to think. He warns them not to allow their heart to run away with them, like the Rich Fool who resolved to pull down his barns and build greater. To all such our Lord's advice is, Think. The same applies to those whose zeal for religion is apt to run away with them. These are urged to perform the sobering function of counting the cost. And in all His conflicts with the Scribes and Pharisees the burden of His message was continually, Think, man, think. "And he saith unto them, Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a life or to kill?" But they refused to face up to the question; they ran away from reality, because their Heart bade them do it. Nevertheless, our Lord in season and out of season appeals to

their common sense in the hope that He will be able to bring them into contact with reality. He even tries to bring them down to earth by employing the powerful weapon of ridicule. But, for the most part, all His efforts were of no avail. In the case of the Apostles, as we shall see in a moment, His teaching was not in vain, but it was no easy task to keep even their feet to the firm ground of reality. Immediately after St. Peter's great confession, for instance, it was necessary that our Lord should speak very strongly to him in order to prevent his heart from running away with him. And the burden of our Lord's rebuke was just this: Your thinking is all wrong.

Our Lord also recognized quite plainly the multiplicity of the Heart, and He strove to get men to see the necessity for its unification. This comes out in many parts of His teaching. There are few more graphic pictures in the Gospels than that of the vacant Heart besieged by seven other evil Hearts which enter in and dwell there. In the parable of the sower the multiplicity of the Heart is clearly in evidence in the thorny soil, where the Heart which has received the seed is strangled by the pressure and overcrowding of other Hearts. And our Lord suggests that this multiplicity of the Heart will always be with us to the end, just as it was in the days of Noah, and He warns His disciples: "But take heed to yourselves lest your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life."

As against all this, He sets forward the ideal of the single Heart, or, as He calls it, the single eye. He urges His followers not to be "of doubtful mind," but to seek first God's kingdom and God's righteousness. He administers a rebuke to Martha just because she has a multiple heart, and He praises Mary, for her heart was one.

We can see the result of all this wonderful training and teaching in the conversion of the Apostles, or, at least, of eleven of them. It was a gradual process of integration and of illumination, moving side by side. There was, indeed, a climax reached on the Day of Pentecost, after our Lord's Ascension. But we can only appreciate its true significance by remembering that it was the conclusion of a long and gradual process. And when it came, it was a true conversion, since it brought not only unification, but also illumination. It would take us too far afield to enquire closely here into these wonderful happenings, but it does not seem to be open to doubt that, whatever it was precisely that occurred, it was an experience which bore the twofold character of unifier and illuminator. This seems to be suggested by the use of the traditional symbols of the Spirit—wind and flame—signifying respectively power and light.

The unification of the personalities of the Apostles at Pentecost is obvious and plain to see. They are changed men. But wherein consisted their illumination? We can only judge from their preaching. What was it that they went forth to proclaim? It has been too much overlooked that they did not preach the doctrine of assurance, and the certainty of salvation. They did not, in fact, preach about themselves at all. They preached Jesus Christ, His Birth, Passion, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension. That was the continual burden of their message. Surely we may infer that the illumination they received at Pentecost was a revelation of Him. Such, according to the Fourth Gospel, was our Lord's explicit promise. At all events, we know that on one point at least they received light—namely, on the meaning of the Cross. They realized (for St. Peter said so in his sermon, or speech, on the Day of Pentecost) that it was no accident, but part of the divine plan. And no doubt they received light on many other points too. The meaning of many things our Lord had said, which at the time when they were spoken they had failed to grasp, suddenly dawned on them, as the inhibitions which had prevented them from grasping His meaning broke down. For this is the central point to understand concerning the conversion of the Apostles at Pentecost. The unification of their Hearts by the breaking down of inhibitions (manifested in the speaking with tongues) and the illumination of their minds were just two sides of the same process. It was the manifoldness of their Hearts which had prevented their Minds from perceiving the truth as it is in Jesus.

Thus, although there was an element of suddenness in the case of the conversion of the Apostles at Pentecost, or, at any rate, in the case of some of them (I do not feel certain that they *all* spoke with tongues), when it came, it seems to have come as an illumination. It is necessary and important to emphasize this, for, as Professor Pratt has reminded us, too much stress has been laid upon conversions of the Pauline and Augustinian and Bunyan types, in which an overwhelming "sense of sin" has preceded the conversion. What we seem to find in the case of the Apostles is rather, perhaps, the completion of something which had previously been lacking, the "solution" of an "uneasiness," as James would say.

Let us now draw, in conclusion, one or two practical lessons. It is evident that in the work of Adult Religious Education we have to achieve a twofold purpose. We have to unify the Heart, and we have to enlighten the Mind. The evidence, we have been insisting, goes to show that these two objects are realized interdependently. Nevertheless, it is impossible to illumine the Mind without tackling the Heart, for the simple

reason that the latter will not suffer the former to operate except under its direction. "None so blind as those who will not see." Thus the Pharisees would not allow our Lord to educate them. In like manner much of our teaching runs off people's minds like water off a duck's back. The churchwarden who rose to his feet at a meeting of the Church Council, at which the chairman had been endeavouring to educate his flock, and who said, "Look here, Vicar, we do not know all this, and we do not want to know it," was, I fear, the spokesman for a multitude which no man can number.

Plainly, therefore, the Heart must be tackled first. Afterwards, if we are fortunate, we may be able to effect a real conversion by bringing the Mind into contact with reality. No doubt there are grave dangers involved in this method, for the stirring of the Heart alone is productive of fanaticism, as Ray Strachey has recently pointed out. Yet no other course is possible, and, in fact, the most ardent enthusiast for truth derives that very enthusiasm from his Heart. It is evident that a great deal depends upon the character of the person who first stirs the Heart. If he himself is a lover of truth, no evil consequences are likely to follow.

When we look round upon the vast population of this country (to confine our attention here), and we see that the great majority of men never think of anything in their spare time except football and cinemas and such like, we may feel inclined to despair. How are we to awaken these people to higher interests? I am persuaded that the most fruitful method is to appeal to the Heart through acts of kindness. The kindness and goodness of professing Christians, if it were the order of the day (as, alas, it is not), would, as I think, in a comparatively short time effect the beginnings of a large-scale revival of spiritual life. As St. Augustine has told us, it was the kindness of St. Ambrose to him which first powerfully attracted him, before the arguments of Ambrose made any impression at all. Given these conditions, there would be no lack of persons in the Church earnestly desirous of learning the knowledge of the truth. Unfortunately, we appear at present to be going round in a vicious circle. Nothing seems to be clearer than that many people in the Church (perhaps the majority) have but a feeble desire to advance in the knowledge of the truth. Why? Because it is not the love of Christ, who is true, and good, and beautiful, which has drawn them to the Church, but some form of self-interest. This means that they are enslaved by selfish phantasies, and so are blind to the truth. More terrible and more fatal still, many of us clergy are in a like case. The result is that not only do the aforesaid individuals inside the Church

not desire to know the truth, but they actually hinder those outside, who do desire that knowledge, from thinking that they are likely to find it in the teachings of a society which can produce persons of this description. Truly our Lord is wounded in the house of His friends.

L. DEWAR.

NOTES ON MENTAL PRAYER

THE purpose of this paper is to discuss those paths of prayer which lie beyond the Ignatian method of meditation. The Ignatian method is, in most cases, the foundation of mental prayer, and one which most of us know something about. Perhaps we have looked at it, and decided it was too complicated (though, rightly understood and used, it is not really so); perhaps we have tried it, found it boring, and given it up; perhaps we have never taken it seriously; nevertheless, it is a method of prayer which must be reckoned with. Far too few people seem to realize that there are other ways of mental prayer to which perfectly ordinary people can attain, and which can result in very close union with God.

It is well to understand at the outset that no two souls are exactly the same, and that the Holy Ghost calls them to very varying degrees of intimacy with God and very varying ways of attaining that intimacy; consequently, it would be dangerous to force a soul whose normal way was the Prayer of Loving Regard to confine itself to Ignatian meditation, and it might result in serious derangement. It is wise, then, for those who have the guidance of souls to acquaint themselves with the accumulated experience of those who, down the ages, have themselves advanced far in the prayer life. The study of this accumulated experience shows that although, as we have said, no two souls are exactly alike, yet praying souls do, on the whole, fall into certain fairly well-defined classes, and do follow with advantage certain known ways of prayer; and it is important for priests to know what these ways are, so that they can guide their people aright. These ways may not be our own, but that does not matter.

There are many definitions of prayer, the classical one being that of St. John Damascene, "the elevation of the soul to God" (*De Fide Orth.*, I., iii., c. 24). A recent author has further defined it as "Loving God in act, so that, one with Him in mind and heart, the Divine Life may communicate Itself freely to us,

and through us to the world" (Fahey, *Mental Prayer According to the Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas*, p. 41).

If these definitions are true, as I believe them to be, prayer must be the lifting up of the whole soul, the whole being to God, imagination, intellect, desire, affections, and will. In the earlier stages of the prayer life this usually has to be done explicitly and deliberately, which is the purpose of the Ignatian meditation, designed to bring into play first the imagination, then the intellect, then the affections, and finally the will, the whole being pervaded with the desire for God.

Now, if prayer is, as has been said, "loving God in act," it will always involve the three elements of intellection, affection, and conation, because, while love is chiefly conative, it is nevertheless the act of the whole soul. But these elements will differ in character and proportion according to the state of the individual soul.

Advance in prayer is not only possible but normal to one who perseveres in its practice, and one would hardly expect a soul to remain permanently satisfied with Ignatian meditation.

Advance in prayer is characterized by an increase in simplicity, depth, and stillness. Prayer is, at first, a complex business, because the soul is complex and in many points at odds with itself, the world, and God. This complexity can only be reduced to order by careful self-discipline and deep penitence, as well as by perseverance in prayer. More than one saint tells us that "mortification and prayer are the two wings by which the soul rises to God," and Fr. Augustine Baker reminds us "that they must neither of them ever cease, but continually increase in perfection and virtue to the end of our lives" (*Holy Wisdom*, p. 197). We may also remind ourselves of the words of St. Paul, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth" (Col. iii. 3, 5). By the faithful use of mortification and prayer the soul becomes more and more at unity in itself and "oned" to God, because its manifold desires tend to find their satisfaction more and more in the Will of God. The soul itself, therefore, tends to become progressively simpler, deeper, and quieter, and this simplicity, depth, and quietness is expressed in its prayer.

I

The first simplification which takes place is intellectual. Most people in the early stages of prayer need some considerations to afford matter upon which the mind can work, something to think about, hence the stress often laid upon "three points." This thinking, however, is not an end in itself; we do not, or

should not, enter into mental prayer in order to think, but in order to love. The purpose, then, of considerations in mental prayer is not that we may preach ourselves sermons, or work out interesting problems in speculative theology, but that the mind may be directed toward God and, being so directed, may set the heart afire. The business of the soul in prayer is with God, not with its own thoughts; consequently, in course of time, usually before very long, the soul finds that it needs fewer and less varied considerations, the mind is satisfied, and more deeply satisfied with a simple look at God than before it was with much thinking. The weight of prayer is shifted from the mind to the affections. This does not mean that prayer becomes merely sentimental, for sentimental prayer is of no use to God or man; nor that the mind ceases to work, but that the mind intuitively, and sometimes almost unconsciously, assumes without labour the prayer relationship to God, and the soul enters straight away into the prayer of the heart and will.

At this point it may be helpful to consider a method of meditation which is considerably simpler than the Ignatian and more helpful to some souls—namely, the method of St. Sulpice. M. Olier, who was one of its great advocates, speaks of it as "communion with the internal dispositions of our Lord." The Ignatian method, as it is commonly practised, tends sometimes to become rather superficial by overmuch attention to the external actions of the Gospel story. The Sulpician method seeks to enter into the spiritual reality of which they are the expression, "la vie intime de Dieu," as a recent French writer has phrased it, and so enter into communion with Jesus Himself, and by that communion become like unto Him.

The method of prayer of which we are speaking consists essentially of three simple acts of which our Lord Himself is the sole object:

1. *Jesus before the eyes* (Adoration). The soul having placed itself in the Presence of Jesus contemplates Him in one of His virtues—*e.g.*, humility, obedience, love—looking at some of the incidents in the Gospel which illustrate it, or at some of His teaching upon it, but in quite a general sort of way—*e.g.*, it looks at Jesus humble before Pilate; it does not try to argue about it or draw out explicitly all its implications, it looks and adores. It is concerned with Him, not with a subject.

The intellect, like the tongue, is an unruly member. It loves to work out its own ideas about God, and in its own place such intellection is right and proper; but in prayer it needs to learn the illumination of adoration, its attitude is "Lord, enlighten me, show me Thyself." That is the attitude here.

2. *Jesus in the heart* (Communion). The soul now draws into itself, as it were, the virtue which it has seen in our Lord. It sees that virtue in its beauty and its own lack of it, and desires with all the intensity of which it is capable to be like Jesus in this thing; it desires His purity, His love, His humility or whatever it may be, and prays earnestly for it. "As the hart desireth the water-brooks, so longeth my soul after Thee, O Lord." Through His virtues it desires Him and finds Him.

3. *Jesus in the hands* (Co-operation). Here the will comes into play, and the soul lays itself whole in the Will of God. "My God, I give myself to Thee, Thine ever, only Thine to be." All right action is the result of co-operation between the human will and the Will of God; it is evident that this act is most important and most full of love, and it will usually issue in some simple and definite resolution.

This simple plan is patient of almost infinite variation to suit the needs of different souls and the same soul at different times, and it is strange that it is not better known than it is.

It should be noticed that in this way of prayer the action of the intellect has changed its character, and discursive reasoning has given place to concentrated attention to God, the prayer becoming simpler, deeper, and quieter. The mind, no longer occupied with roving over a variety of facts, ideas, and arguments, is free to look simply upon God. God is the end of its activity, rather than its own satisfaction, and this occupation with God brings true satisfaction and real illumination.

II

In the still simpler states of prayer which we are now to consider, the action of the intellect is always of this simply perceptive sort; indeed, it tends to become still simpler, for some souls do not seem to themselves to be using their intellect at all, so much does its action become second nature, and so quickly does the soul pass to acts of love. Some spiritual writers do, indeed, speak of the paralysis of the mind which takes place in certain stages of the prayer life, and those who have practised such prayer know what is meant; nevertheless, it is certain that the intellect is not really paralyzed, but actually working unconsciously and without hindrance, absorbed with God. The central activity of prayer now is in the affections.

Affective prayer is the prayer of Christ's lovers, and surely they should not be so very rare. For them the truths of religion do not require perpetual argument and restatement, for they have deepened into profound convictions, the truths by which the soul lives. They know the truth, and the truth makes them

free, free from deliberate delight in sin, free to love God, and their prayer is the action of that love. This prayer is expressed in repeated acts of the will. Words are reduced to a minimum, often the same phrase repeated over and over again. This is not a vain repetition, for the sole purpose of the phrase or word is to direct the action of the soul and hold it in the presence of God, and the real work is being done underneath without words.

For souls who are drawn to this kind of prayer, it is useful to keep a note-book, into which can be copied phrases which may be useful in prayer. Scraps of the Gospels which have become luminous by meditation, words of our Lord, or the Apostles, or the saints, bits of the psalms, hymns, all short and such as may be used in a breath. "Short prayer pierceth heaven" not, in this case, because it is short, but because it may be used over and over again.

Some people prefer to use more extended prayers, not continuously, but repeating each phrase until its sweetness has all been extracted and then passing on to the next. In this case the soul should move freely, not feeling any necessity to use the whole prayer, but only so much of it as it needs. The formula is a vehicle of the soul's love, its act, and not a substitute for effort, or a cage.

Some people, again, prefer to have a method, especially at first, because the simplicity of this way of prayer is apt to be deceptive, and to give the impression that the soul is doing little or nothing when it is probably doing exactly what God requires of it. The experience of most people, however, is that the more this way of prayer is used, the less possible or desirable it is to bind the soul down to any method at all. Prayer becomes more and more a loving converse between the soul and its God—a converse of speech and silence, of stammering words oft repeated, as the child in its mother's arms cannot, and need not, say more than "I love you . . . I love you."

For those who do need a scheme, it is possible to make one something on the lines of the methods of meditation which have been already considered.

All prayer should begin with God, continue with God, and end with God. If the whole of one's prayer time is spent in quietly closing the door of the soul on all else and looking at God only, so far from its having been wasted, which some would think it had been, it has been very perfectly occupied; indeed, the final simplicity to which many attain is nothing more than this. On the other hand, many people spend their prayer time in great activity, praying earnestly for a variety of objects, persons, and virtues, and yet have really hardly prayed at all,

because they have been occupied with things rather than God. In this method, then, the soul should begin by looking straight at God in *adoration*. Seeing God, it then sees itself truly, as it is in His sight, and realizes its own nothingness and creatureliness, which leads to an act of *humility*. Further, in the light of the infinite Purity of God, it sees its own sin, and falls before Him in an act of *penitence*.

We now come to the body of the prayer, which consists in acts of the theological virtues.

First of *Faith*. I do not mean by that the repetition of the Creed or any statement of one's belief, but rather a look of loving faith. This act is a contemplation of God in some fundamental truth—*e.g.*, His love, His holiness, His majesty, or, perhaps, quite simply and generally in Himself. Souls vary immensely in their *attrait* in this matter, but perhaps for most it is well generally to contemplate God here in His eternal Being as distinct from His relationship to His creation, His work for man, or His dealings with the individual soul.

There follows an act of *Hope*, and here one is concerned with His revelation, His redemption, His grace. In this one puts one's whole trust in Him and His grace. It is the Hope of the Cross, "I thirst." I thirst for God and know that I shall be satisfied; I thirst for the souls of men that they, too, may be filled with Him. It is, then, a real act of intercession, a lifting up of the whole world to the Father.

Finally, and this is the apex of the whole prayer, an Act of *Charity*. For the purpose of our thought this may be divided into two parts, though in practice they become almost if not quite one. One should aim here at depth and calm, by an act of the rational will directing our whole being to God and holding it in Him. That is the first part, and from it flows the second, the clear intention to conform one's whole will at every moment to the Will of God.

It is clear that this way of prayer is very deep; it is, as it were, the movement of the whole soul, or better, perhaps, the stillness of the whole soul in union with God; the acts of which it consists, although they appear complicated in speech, are of the utmost simplicity, and tend as time goes on to become still simpler and more inexpressible in word. As the method we have been considering becomes more familiar, the soul is able to rely more wholly upon the Holy Ghost for the form which its acts shall take, and it is difficult to distinguish always between an act of faith and an act of love when these virtues have become, as they should, closely interwoven in the very fabric of the soul.

One point needs emphasis. The exercise of prayer we are considering, and, indeed, all forms of the prayer of acts, as well

as the further way of prayer we have yet to consider, need time for their exercise. One of the first marks of any form of advance in prayer is the need which the soul feels for more time for communion with God. The method of prayer I have sketched consists only of six acts expressed in few or no words; other ways are even simpler, but the soul that uses it will not be content with a bare ten minutes for its exercises, half an hour will probably find it unfinished, and before long an hour will seem all too short. Almost anyone who prays at all can use a prayer of acts for five or ten minutes, but only souls which are ready for this way of prayer can persist in it without effort on the one hand, or day-dreaming on the other, for, say, half an hour daily. To them it is the natural way of approach to God, not merely a bit of spiritual excitement, and continuance in it and ability to use it for a fair length of time are among the surest signs that a soul is ripe to use it.

A beautiful instance of the use of this kind of prayer occurs in the early life of St. Francis. "While St. Francis was still in the secular habit . . . Bernard of Assisi . . . invited him one evening to sup with him and to pass the night. St. Francis accepted the invitation, and took supper with him and stayed the night also; and then Bernard resolved to make trial of his sanctity. Wherefore he got a bed prepared for him in his own room, in which a lamp was always burning all night. St. Francis, in order to conceal his sanctity, immediately on entering the room, threw himself on the bed and feigned to sleep; and Bernard likewise resolved to lie down, and began to snore loudly as if in a very deep slumber.

"Thereupon St. Francis, believing that Bernard was really asleep, rose from the bed and betook himself to prayer; and raising his eyes and his hands to heaven, with the greatest emotion and fervour, he said, 'My God, my God.' So saying, and shedding many tears, he remained till morning, continually repeating 'My God, my God,' and nothing more. And this he said contemplating and admiring the excellency of the Divine Majesty, which deigned to stoop down to the world that was perishing, and to provide a remedy for the salvation of his soul, and through him—His poor little Francis—for the salvation of the souls of others" (*Fioretti di San Francesco*, c. i.).

III

It would seem that we had now reached the simplest way of prayer of which ordinary folk are capable, but there is another and a simpler, that which, following Bossuet, we may call the Prayer of Simplicity or Simple Regard. It is well to remind

ourselves at this point that advance in prayer goes with advance in holiness, and it is very unusual for a soul that has frequent lapses into the grosser or more obvious sins really to attain to this way of prayer, though it is by no means unusual for such a soul to imagine that this is its way. I do not want to suggest that souls who practise this prayer must be sinless—that would be nonsense—nor that they are free from temptation, for generally they are very sorely tried, but they should have attained to a recognizable degree of self-conquest and unification. This is no prayer for undisciplined or sentimental souls, though such people sometimes think it is because little books put that idea into their heads, and they think it is "so beautiful." This is a further simplification of the prayer of love we have just been considering, and there is, perhaps, no difference in kind, but rather in degree. We need always to remember that all prayer is one, though its ways are various, and all true change of the prayer-life of a soul is ordered by the Holy Ghost.

In the prayer of simplicity the whole self is deliberately gathered up into one, mental images are deliberately refused, and the mind is occupied with the simple regard of God; the affections are not occupied with separate acts as before, but, as it were, stretch out to and desire God, and the will holds the whole self still in the presence of God that He may do what He will with it.

To those who are unfamiliar with it, this way of prayer may sound somewhat unusual, but it is not so. Some time ago I was discussing prayer with a circle of layfolk, who were doing their best to pray well. When I had said something about this way of prayer, one of them said, "Oh, but, of course, none of us pray in that way. It needs a St. Teresa to do that." The rest, however—and they were quite a haphazard collection of ordinary folk collected from various places—exclaimed instantly that that was exactly what they were doing or trying to do. This is not a mystical way of prayer, but one which God gives to many of His lovers.

It is almost formless, and does not need words, and that fact makes it very difficult to describe; nevertheless, it is possible to discern certain characteristics in the souls which practise it, and so in their prayer.

An old English writer, in speaking of this way, says: "All thy life now must in all ways stand in *desire*, if thou shalt advance in degree of perfection. This desire must all ways be wrought in thy will by the hand of Almighty God and thy consent" (*Cloud of Unknowing*, c. ii.). That desire is desire for God. Theoretically, I suppose, we all desire God, but it is extraordinarily easy merely to desire Him for His gifts. "Jesus hath many lovers

of His kingdom of heaven," writes Thomas à Kempis, "but He hath few bearers of His cross. Many desire His consolation, but few desire His tribulation. He findeth many His fellows at eating and drinking, but He findeth few that will be with Him in His abstinence and fasting. All men would joy with Him, but few would anything suffer for Christ. Many follow Him to the breaking of His bread to their bodily refection, but few will follow Him to drink a draught of the chalice of His passion. Many marvel and honour His miracles, but few will follow the shame of His cross. Many love Jesus so long as no adversity befalleth them, and can praise Him and bless Him when they receive any benefit of Him; but if Jesus a little withdraw Himself from them, and a little forsake them, anon they fall to some great grudging, or to over great dejection.

"They that love Jesus purely for Himself, and not for their own profit and commodity, bless Him as heartily in temptation, tribulation, and all other adversities as they do in the time of consolation. And if He never sent them consolation, yet they would always laud Him and praise Him" (*Imitation of Christ*, Bk. II., c. ii.).

The burning desire of God for Himself is the ruling passion of souls in this way of prayer—God in consolation or desolation, God revealing or hiding Himself, God in joy or pain.

This desire shows itself in love, not in sentimentality or pious talk, but in love of the will issuing in self-surrender, in the more and more complete co-operation of the human will with the Will of God. "Domine, non nisi Te."

It is important to realize that God is loved in this way by the will; the mind sees Him, the heart is attracted by Him, the will loves Him, and, however silent and simple the prayer may be, these activities do not cease, but become more perfect and therefore less noticeable. The will is surrendered, but it is still the will; it still has to give itself from moment to moment to the Will of God. The independent, even the conscious, action of the will may seem to cease in prayer, but if the prayer is right the will is still working, holding God. The Holy Ghost has taken charge, the will is given, but the will is still the will co-operating with the God it loves.

Rightly practised, this way of prayer is free from the dangers of quietism. Quietism requires the soul to empty itself of self and all else, and wait for God to fill it, and in doing so it is in danger of becoming the empty, swept and garnished house into which entered, not God, but seven devils. Quietism, by laying undue stress upon the inner light, puffs the soul up with pride, so that it believes itself to be infinitely superior to less "spiritual" people, and independent of the beautiful means of grace by

which God ordinarily communicates Himself to His people. Such an attitude is mischievous to the last degree, but it is not the attitude of the prayer of simplicity in which, by the grace of God, the soul keeps itself low and humble, and holds itself steady in the Will of God, under His hand.

It is to be feared that many of the folk who talk glibly today about Mysticism are very largely quietist. Mysticism, someone has remarked, begins in mist, centres round I, and ends in schism. A cruel jibe and one absolutely untrue of the real mystics, but only too true of much popular mysticism. No sane person should set out to be a mystic; he should set out to be a man of God utterly given to the guidance of the Holy Ghost and humbly surrendered to Him, which is a very different thing.

Another misconception which should be cleared up is the idea that this kind of prayer is merely pleasant dreaming. The description here given of it should have dispelled that idea, but it is necessary to mention it. Dilettante dabblers in prayer easily fall into such dreaming, but people who mean business are commonly taught better, before they have gone very far, by the Holy Ghost and hard experience, for the way of prayer is not a way of sugar and roseleaves if one keeps to the true path. St. Teresa has many straight things to say about this kind of dreaminess, and it certainly is a danger for which anyone who is responsible for the direction of a soul in these ways of prayer should be on the watch. There is always a danger of it in souls which desire to get rather than to give, and verily the essence of this prayer is giving.

The prayer of simplicity, indeed all true prayer, so far from being enervating, is bracing, and its results are clearly visible in life. "By their fruits ye shall know them." If prayer is making a person selfish and peevish and difficult to live with, then it is no true prayer. I heard of a family once which had a sort of Sunday morning password: "Father has been to Communion this morning; look out for squalls." Prayer is not a pleasant hour with God, which has to be paid for afterwards by other people. Affective prayer rightly used issues in more and more continuous recollection and life lived moment by moment for God and with God.

Thus prayer ceases to be something which is practised from time to time, entirely separate from that other entity which we call life, prayer and life being treated as two things, as separate and dissimilar as are work and play. The whole of life becomes suffused by the spirit of recollection, and everything that is done or said becomes naturally and without any cant an act of prayer, and gradually the soul learns always to live with God. Thus life and prayer become one thing and not two.

Here a danger of abstract vagueness has to be guarded against, the feeling that, since one has the recollection of the presence of God always and all is done for Him, one has no need of vocal prayer, times of prayer, or even sacraments. This is a real and great danger, and by yielding to it the spirit of prayer may evaporate altogether. It is a danger to which that great teacher Baron von Hügel was very keenly alive; he points out that the Church by insisting on definite forms in her public worship demands rightly some vocal prayer of all her children. I cannot do better than conclude what I have to say about this matter in his words: "A simply mental prayer does (he says) readily feel, to the soul that possesses the habit of it, a complete substitute for all vocal prayer; and a generally prayerful habit of mind readily appears an improvement upon all conscious acts of prayer. . . . Yet . . . this feeling will rapidly lead the soul on to become unconsciously weak or feverish, unless the soul manfully escapes from this feeling's tyranny and nobly bends under the yoke and cramps itself within the narrow limits of the lifegiving concrete act" (*Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. i., p. 74).

The Baron was intensely alive to the fundamental importance of mental prayer, and himself practised it, but he realized deeply, and would have others also grasp, the regular necessity of the contrary action as well. Like all true teachers of spirituality, he would have us be intensely concrete.

There is one other point with which we must deal. It is sometimes objected by folk who should know better that these ways of prayer are merely selfish reverie. I hope enough has been said to show that reverie is about the last word which can rightly be applied to them, but it may be well to reply briefly to the accusation of selfishness.

There is a modern craze for catchwords which is responsible, I think, for some misunderstanding. We are told, for instance, that in these ways of prayer we are "Alone with the Alone." I do not believe that that phrase describes the situation at all. In the first place, it is not Christian but Neoplatonic, for the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is the negation of aloneness in the Godhead; and as a description of the praying soul it fails, for one is never less alone than when one is at prayer. True prayer unites the soul to God, who is Himself the Source and Sustainer of all being; consequently, the nearer the soul comes to Him the closer it is to all creation, the more vital becomes its relationship to the whole Church. The praying soul, therefore, comes before God, not as an individual, but as part of His Creation and Family; consequently, whatever form its prayer may take, it is not merely an individual, it is uniting the world

with God, and the closer its own union is with Him so much the more radical is its action upon and for its neighbour. The element of intercession is radical and not accidental. Specific acts of intercession may grow less, but only as the work of intercession deepens; one may pray less for specific happenings and love more to hold souls in the Will of God. As the soul's prayer-life deepens it knows, if it is on the right path, that it is not enjoying a private heaven, but exercising the priesthood which God has given it.

St. Teresa with her habitual wisdom prefaces one of her very valuable dissertations on prayer with these words: "I do not mean, and I have never thought, that what I am now going to say is so accurate that it should be held as an infallible rule: that would be folly in matters so difficult. But, as there are many ways in the way of the Spirit, it may be that I shall say something to the purpose concerning some of them: and if they do not understand me who are not travelling this way, that will be because they are travelling on another, and if I do good to nobody our Lord will accept my goodwill, for He knows that, if I have not experienced it all myself, I have observed it in other souls" (*Foundations*, p. 38).

The ways of prayer dealt with here will doubtless appear strange to some readers, while to others they will be quite natural. It is hoped that even so slight a sketch as the present may be of use to priests to whom is committed the cure of souls, for they are perfectly normal ways by which God draws many souls, Protestant as well as Catholic, simple as well as learned, to Himself.

F. P. HARTON.

FOUR NEW PRAYER BOOKS

THE Prayer Books recently put forth by three Churches of the Anglican Communion—the English, Scottish, and American—present an interesting comparative study, a kind of Synoptic problem. Analogies are proverbially misleading, but one is tempted to liken the Free Church Book of Common Prayer,* which has also lately appeared, to a Fourth Gospel, starting from a tradition different from that of the Synoptists, but on many points coinciding with it and showing a considerable amount of agreement in detail.

The publication of this book is a remarkable sign of the times. It covers a wide area, drawing its material from sources

* J. M. Dent and Sons, 1929, 3s. 6d.

as far apart as the Liturgy of St. Clement on the one hand, and the late Dr. Martineau on the other. It begins with ten Orders of Worship, two of them nearly identical with our Mattins and Evensong, the rest framed on other models, one of them even being "boldly designed so that it may be used by non-Christian as well as by Christian theists."* But the startling feature of the book is its recognition of doctrines and practices which Protestantism has hitherto vehemently repudiated. The Order for the Celebration of the Eucharist contains the Benedictus, the Agnus Dei, and a space for silent adoration. There are Holy Days in abundance, among them Corpus Christi and All Souls. Provision is made for the Unction of the Sick and for Communion from the Reserved Sacrament. The Offices of Prime and Compline are given. There are many prayers for the departed.

When Athene sprang fully armed from the head of Zeus, heaven and earth are said to have trembled. A similar commotion now in the Free Church world at having given birth to so strange an offspring as this would not cause surprise. The book, of course, claims no official authority, and one can hardly suppose that it will be used by more than a small section, but should it represent a growing movement—and it is significant that a second impression was called for within a month of publication—its effects will be far-reaching, not least on the problems of reunion. If in what follows we do not deal with it in the same detail as with the others, this is from no lack of respect, but because it is not easy for the most part to bring it into line with them, and because it deserves separate treatment.

The title page of the new Prayer Book of the Church of England bears witness to its present lack of full authorization. "The Book of Common Prayer with the additions and deviations proposed in 1928." The Episcopal Church of Scotland has neatly adapted the 1662 title page to her own use, by adding the word Scottish before "Book of Common Prayer" and omitting "according to the use of the Church of England." The American Church likewise follows the 1662 wording as far as "Psalms of David," substituting for "the Church of England" "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America." Although not mentioned on the title page, the Ordinal is included in the book.

As regards prefatory matter, the Scottish book is the most concise and up to date, giving simply the two present-day Canons of the Episcopal Church which deal with worship and the administration of the sacraments. America retains the preface to her original book of 1789, and England adds a new one to the three already existing.

* *A Free Church Book of Common Prayer*, Foreword, p. ix.

In the Calendar all add the Transfiguration (August 6) to the red-letter days. Here America led the way as early as 1886. England alone restores St. Mary Magdalen (July 22), which was included in 1549 and dropped in 1552. Five national saints are raised to red-letter rank in the Scottish book, St. Kentigern, St. Patrick, St. Columba, St. Ninian, and St. Margaret of Scotland.

Of black-letter days the American book is as bare as the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., and the Calendar looks distressingly meagre. The Scottish list contains almost all the entries in the English, and is far richer, with 108 commemorations as against 87. It is also racy of the soil, and some of the names look strange to southern eyes, such as Kessog, Maelrubha, Devenic, and Drostan. The traditional loyalty of Scotland to the Stuarts comes out in the observance of January 30 as the Beheading of King Charles I. This was removed from the English Calendar by the King's Printers without authority in 1859, when the service of commemoration was discontinued. The English authorities have, perhaps wisely, not reinstated it.

The new Lectionaries all follow the ecclesiastical instead of the civil year. The outstanding feature of the Scottish one is a three years' course of Sunday Lessons, an admirable plan of enlarging the amount of Scripture heard by the regular worshipper. It avoids the subjectivity of the English Lectionary, where the choice between two or sometimes three possibilities encourages the minister to adapt the Lessons to his sermon instead of his sermon to the Lessons.

The English and Scottish books print the Introduction to Morning or Evening Prayer separately from the offices. The American follows the 1662 arrangement, but in the Orders themselves makes several important departures, mostly dating from 1789, and reflecting a liturgical outlook which is now somewhat obsolete. The Venite is an amalgam of Psalms xcv. and xcvi. Only the first four verses of the Benedictus need be used, except on the Sundays in Advent; this, indeed, has the practical advantage of making it the same length as the Jubilate, and so less liable to be superseded by it. The Gloria in Excelsis may be sung at Evensong at the end of the Psalms, and in each office the Nicene Creed is given as an alternative to the Apostles'; these are surely needless interferences with Eucharistic associations of long standing. On the other hand, an excellent addition to the Canticles has been made in the Benedictus es, printed as the first alternative to the Te Deum, which, like the Benedicite, is taken from the LXX of Daniel iii. (vv. 29-34). This has been copied in the Scottish book, and, as the Dean of Edinburgh in his

admirable companion to that work* informs us,† is, besides the note explaining the meaning of hell in the Apostles' Creed, practically the only American contribution to it. In the Canticles, except the Te Deum, and in the Psalter the American book marks the second half of each verse with an asterisk, an irritating innovation. If such a help to orderly recitation is really needed, would not a capital letter or a bar have served the purpose ?

An improvement on the earlier American forms is seen in the restoration of the Lord's Prayer after the Creed, when it has not already been said, and at Evensong the full form of the Versicles and Responses has been given since 1892. The last Response but one reads, "For it is thou, Lord, only, that makes us dwell in safety." The English book has, "Because there is none other that ruleth the world, but only thou, O God." These changes mark a widely felt difficulty about the old Response, but the Scottish book, which perhaps takes less account of modern scruples than the other two, makes no alteration here.

The Scottish Mattins is practically identical with the English as far as the third Collect, except that the Benedictus es takes the place of the incongruous Psalm li. as the second alternative to the Te Deum. A composite prayer for the King, the Royal Family, the Ministers of the Crown, and Parliament, is given as an alternative for the State prayers. In Evensong the Psalms formerly allowed in place of the Gospel Canticles are happily dropped. A second ending to the service is added with seven intercessory prayers. Compline follows Evensong instead of being relegated to an appendix as in the English book, but there is no Order for Prime. The Quicunque Vult is given in the revised translation only, and is ordered to be used on Trinity Sunday. England has abandoned the obligation to recite it, and the formulary itself has never appeared in the American book, having been discarded as far back as 1785.‡ The mention of it has been cut out of the 8th Article.

The Scottish and American Litanies agree in dropping "miserable sinners" from the opening clauses, and all three books make the supplication after the Lord's Prayer optional. The Scottish adds two other Litanies, the first an abbreviation of the old, and the second a still shorter one, founded on the Greek model, with the response, "Lord, have mercy." These

* *The Scottish Prayer Book : Its Value and History*, by W. Perry, D.D., Cambridge University Press, 1929, 4s. 6d. The Prayer Book itself is also published by the Cambridge Press, prices from 1s. upwards.

† P. 37.

‡ Procter and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, Additional Note to chap. viii., on the Prayer Book in U.S.A., pp. 237 *f*.

provisions are far more satisfactory than the English permission to the officiant to leave out almost as much as he likes.

In occasional prayers Scotland leads the way with 57, England having 48, and America 36. Some 20 of those in the Scottish and English books are the same. Few of the newly added prayers in any of the books seem to stand out as having special excellence.* One of the most beautiful, Bishop Wilson's prayer for the conversion of the Jews, unfortunately appears only in the Scottish book, where the author's name is attached to it. Scotland and America have done well in providing a Bidding Prayer.

To pass to the Liturgy. The American and the Free Church Prayer Books have made a welcome departure in placing this before the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels instead of after. One would naturally expect the main Order to precede the variable parts, and it is easier to find these by looking on rather than back.

A word as to the history of the Scottish and American rites may be in place. The former owes several of its distinctive features to the so-called Laudian Liturgy of 1637,† but more to those of the English Nonjurors. After going through various intermediate stages, the rite as revised by Bishops Falconer and R.Forbes in 1764 became the recognized Scottish Communion Office, but mainly owing to English objections it was but little used while the Episcopal Church was striving to free itself from its legal disabilities. It has gradually won its way back to favour, and is now of equal authority with the English Office of 1662, which it precedes in the new Prayer Book.

The American rite, originally drawn up in 1789, is nearer than the Scottish to that of 1662, but owing to the influence of Seabury, the first American bishop, who had received his episcopal Orders from the Scottish Church, the Scottish form of consecration was adopted with one alteration, which will be mentioned later.

A comparison of the three Liturgies suggests a recent process of assimilation modifying an earlier tendency to diverge. All provide a shortened form of the Commandments and our Lord's Summary of the Law as an alternative. This has been traditional in Scotland. According to Bishop Dowden‡ it came from the Nonjurors' Office of 1718. All contain the threefold Kyrie in English (in the American rite as an addition to the Summary), England alone restoring also the original "Kyrie

* See *The Occasional Prayers in the* 1928 *Book Reconsidered*, by E. Milner-White, S.P.C.K., 1930.

† Dowden, *The Scottish Communion Office*, 1764, *with Introduction, etc.* (new edit., 1922), p. 33.

‡ *Op. cit.*, pp. 144 *f.*

eleison." All omit the Collect for the King as out of place here; America, of course, has done so from the beginning, and has substituted the second of the post-communion Collects with its reference to laws and commandments. All give the greeting, "The Lord be with you," before the Collect for the Day. Scotland alone requires the Nicene Creed on all occasions; England authorizes its omission on ferial days; America clings to the old bad permission of the Apostles' Creed as a substitute, but allows the Creed to be left out if it has just been said in Morning Prayer. At the Offertory divergences begin to increase. The Scottish rite, after the presentation of the alms and the elements with the formula "Blessed be thou," an adaptation of 1 Chron. xxix. 11 *f.*, proceeds at once to the Sursum Corda and the Canon, the Prayer for the Church following the Consecration, and incorporating at its close St. Matt. xxv. 34, as in 1549 and 1637. England has lengthened and enlarged the Prayer for the Church, which now contains a direct petition for the departed and a commemoration of saints. America, like the others, omits the words "militant here in earth" at the bidding, and adds one clause about the departed, "beseeching thee to grant them continual growth in thy love and service." In theory the Scottish plan of placing the Intercession after the Consecration is amply justified; in practice it is inconvenient, and, as the Dean of Edinburgh points out,* is one of the causes which hinder the general use of the Scottish Liturgy, the unbroken sequence of the two long prayers being a severe strain on the attention of the worshipper. The familiar English arrangement can at least claim the precedent of the earliest account of the Celebration of the Eucharist which we possess, since Justin Martyr (*c.* A.D. 150) twice over describes the consecration and communion as taking place after the prayers are ended.†

A short alternative form of Invitation, Confession, and Absolution, for use on weekdays, is a valuable feature of the English rite. The Prayer of Humble Access follows the Comfortable Words, both in England and Scotland. In the Scottish rite all this, of course, comes after the Consecration and the Intercession, and is, not perhaps very happily, included in the section headed "Communion." In the English form it is called the Preparation, and keeps the place it had in 1662. America follows suit as far as the Comfortable Words, but restores the Prayer to the place for which Cranmer composed it, immediately before the Communion.

* *Op. cit.*, p. 82.

† *First Apology*, chaps. lxv., lxvii.

We come to the vexed question of the Invocation, which in all three rites holds the same position, after the Words of Institution:

ENGLISH.	SCOTTISH.	AMERICAN.
Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to the end that we, receiving the same, may be strengthened and refreshed in body and soul.	And we thine unworthy servants beseech thee, most merciful Father, to hear us, and to send thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that, being blessed and hallowed by his life-giving power, they may become the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, to the end that all who shall receive the same may be sanctified both in body and soul, and preserved unto everlasting life.	And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.

The English form has been criticized on the ground that the words "sanctify and bless" bear a different sense in relation to ourselves and to the gifts.* The American, following the precedents of 1549, 1637, and the Scottish form up to 1912, speaks of "thy Word and Holy Spirit," which raises the question as to the meaning of "Word." Is it the personal Logos as in Serapion's liturgy? Also the petition "that we receiving them," etc., which was worked into the Invocation in 1789 from the English Prayer of Consecration (1552 and onwards) might be thought to indicate a receptionist bias, although it is not clear that this was the motive of the change from the Scottish form.† Before 1912 the Scottish form ended abruptly with the words "dearly beloved Son," and in its nakedness and baldness was, as Bishop Dowden said,‡ without precedent or parallel. The addition of the last clauses, suggested by the Bishop,§ has restored the balance of the sentence, and makes the Scottish Epiklesis on the whole the most satisfactory of the three.

The Free Church Prayer of Consecration, which is somewhat jejune, has the following Invocation in the 1549 position, before the Words of Institution: "We beseech thee to send down the Holy Spirit and sanctify these creatures of bread and wine which we now consecrate to their sacred use, that they may become unto us the most blessed Body and Blood of thy dear Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

* THEOLOGY, March, 1927; *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1927.

† It was due to the influence of the delegates from Maryland. Procter and Frere, p. 245; Dowden, *op. cit.*,p. 103.

‡ Dowden, *op. cit.*, p. 11; *cf.* p. 165.

§ *Op. cit.*, p. 98.

As regards the general rationale of the Invocation the wise words of the Bishop of Moray cannot be too constantly borne in mind: "We ask God to cause the Sacrament to be that which our Lord made it at the Last Supper. No one would wish to ask for more than our Lord signified when He instituted the Eucharist; no one surely would ask for less."*

The restoration of the Pax is a welcome feature of the English and Scottish rites, and the addition in the latter of "Brethren, let us love one another, for love is of God" may well become one of the most impressive features of the service. It will be interesting to notice whether this call to realize one of the prime objects of the Sacrament spreads elsewhere.

Another admirable feature of the Scottish rite is the series of Post-Communions for certain festivals and seasons, corresponding in the main to the Proper Prefaces. These short Collects reach as high a level as anything else in the book.

We need not here discuss the English provisions for Reservation. The Scottish rubric authorizing it, "according to long-existing custom of the Scottish Church," appeared first in the revision of 1912. Mr. F. C. Eeles has told us how its use went back to the penal laws of the eighteenth century, and was common even when the surplice had not been introduced.† It does not seem to be recognized by the American Church, as the sentence relating to it, which was contained in some of the earlier drafts of the proposed changes, is no longer in the rubric about the consumption of the elements.

The Black Rubric has never been found in the authorized American Prayer Book, nor has it ever been appended to the Scottish Liturgy, but in the Scottish book of 1912 it kept its place at the end of the 1662 form. In the new book it has disappeared altogether.

According to the Scottish Canon XXIII. the English Alternative Order of Holy Communion may be substituted under certain conditions for that of 1662 (not for the Scottish Liturgy), "if and when the Episcopal Synod is satisfied that it has been authorized in the Church of England." Should the Bishops decide that it has sufficient authority in England to justify them in sanctioning it in Scotland, a piquant situation would arise; for then the only quarter in which the revised Liturgy of the English Church could be used without suspicion of illegality would be in the sister communion whose own Liturgy was for a century or more practically proscribed owing to English influence. There is, of course, nothing to prevent the Church in Wales from adopting the new English Prayer Book, or any part

* Quoted by Dowden, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

† *Report of Farnham Conference on Reservation*, pp. 110-112.

of it, if it chose to do so, but the Welsh Bishops have not as yet given a lead in that direction.

There is little difference between the English and Scottish baptismal rites. America has telescoped the Orders for the Public and Private Baptism of Infants and for the Baptism of Adults into one form with variations, a procedure of doubtful advantage. All three books happily agree in inserting the Sursum Corda and Vere Dignum as the prelude to the Blessing of the Water, thus restoring the ancient prelude to an act of Consecration. England and Scotland have done the same thing in the Ordinal.

The English Catechism remains unaltered. The Scottish book has modernized some expressions, added notes to explain "quick" and "hell" in the Creed, and "generally necessary" as meaning "necessary for all where they may be had," and has usefully placed before the clauses in the "Duty" the numbers of the Commandments to which they correspond. How many people realize that "to serve Him truly all the days of my life" refers to the fourth? The American expands the Catechism into three Offices of Instruction, adding sections on the Church and the Ministry, but strangely omitting an explanation of the Lord's Prayer. The Catechism in its original form is also given at the end of the book.

The American Order of Confirmation has a Presentation of the Candidates and a Lesson (Acts viii. 14-17) in place of the old Introduction, but otherwise makes little change in the 1662 form, even perpetuating the unfortunate phrase "ratifying and confirming," which has caused so much misapprehension of the meaning of Confirmation. The Scottish Order contains the new Introduction to the English form, and also restores from 1549 the prayer, "Sign them, O Lord," and the signing with the Cross which has long been in use in Scotland. The English alone has before the Blessing the admirable formula of dismissal beginning, "Go forth into the world in peace," one of the best things in the whole book.

The English and Scottish Orders of Marriage agree closely, and both provide a section headed "The Communion." The Scottish includes the Blessing of the Ring, and also appends a form of Benediction of persons who have only received civil marriage. The rule of the Scottish Church (Canon XXX.) is that marriages must take place in church, except with the written sanction of the Bishop. The brevity of the American rite, which contains the Blessing of the Ring, but provides no procession to or prayers at the altar, is perhaps accounted for by the prevalent custom of having weddings in private houses. "The Church . . . or some proper house" is mentioned in the

introductory rubric. A Collect, Epistle, and Gospel at a marriage are, however, provided among those for special occasions. It may be noticed as a sign of the times that in none of the three forms does the wife promise obedience to her husband. The vows taken by both are equal.

The Order for the Visitation of the Sick has been much enlarged and enriched. The English and Scottish forms are nearly the same, but the latter alone adds a short Office of Anointing and Laying on of Hands, "if the sick person so desire it." The American makes the same provision, but does not follow the others in giving a form of Confession and Absolution. It retains, in a shorter form, the prayer "O most merciful God," which, in fact, represents the older absolution in vogue before the "Ego absolvo te" appeared in the twelfth century. In the Scottish book the form for administering Communion from the Reserved Sacrament is conveniently printed in full.

In the Order for the Burial of the Dead the three books mark what we may hope is the final disappearance of the prejudice against prayers for the departed. The Scottish service is on the whole the best arranged. It increases the amount to be said in church, and diminishes that at the grave, with the proviso that any of the prayers may be transferred to the later point. There is a bewildering choice of lessons, eight as against four in the English and three in the American rite, and also of prayers, many of which are taken from other parts of the Prayer Book. The seeming superfluity is doubtless explained by the rubric that the service in church may also be used at Memorial Services. The thanksgiving, so often unreal, for the deliverance of "this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world" is omitted from the first of the 1662 prayers, which in the American book is also remodelled. A prayer for those in sorrow, to be used also at any time of calamity, is exactly what is needed in disasters such as that at Paisley, which darkened the close of 1929. It contrasts favourably with the shorter prayer of the same type in the English form.

There seems a general feeling that the Commination Service has had its day. America retains the latter part of it, from Psalm li. onwards, with slight alterations as a Penitential Office for Ash Wednesday. Scotland does likewise, prefixing the Ten Commandments and the Beatitudes and Woes of St. Luke vi. England provides an alternative Commination with "God shall judge," substituted for "Cursed is he." But far better than any of these is the "Exhortation whereby the people are put in mind of the Law of Christ," which is found at the end of the English book. In view of the excellence of this, the Commination might well have been dropped, the latter part of it being kept as

a separate service for special occasions, as in the American plan. It may be remembered that in the course of the Prayer Book debates a well-known divine related with what delight he had listened to the Exhortation when read experimentally in the Cathedral of which he was a Canon. A new Cranmer must have appeared, he told the Dean afterwards. It was all so good, except one sentence. "Oh," said the Dean, "I put in that myself."

As regards the Ordinal, America provides a short special Litany for use at Ordinations, a much better plan than the English one of making the Litany optional. The difficulty of reconciling with modern ideas the question put to Deacons about unfeigned belief in Holy Scripture is got over by the substitution of the first part of the corresponding question in the Ordination of Priests. In the Ordination of Priests, Caswall's* version of the Veni Creator, "Come Holy Ghost, Creator blest," is given as an alternative to Cosin's, and an alternative form of conferring the Priesthood is added, beginning "Take thou authority to execute the Office of a Priest," and omitting the reference to the forgiving and retaining of sins. It is said that Bishop Seabury was very reluctant to sanction this form.†

The English and Scottish Ordinals deal in a more excellent way with the question referred to above, which now runs as follows: "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given of God to convey to us in many parts and in divers manners the revelation of himself which is fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ?" This welcome alteration should remove many scruples. Both Ordinals also, as already mentioned, restore the Sursum Corda as the Eucharistic opening to the Ordination prayers, and they have removed the prayer for the Deacons from the end of the service to its right place before the laying on of hands.

The American Prayer Book has since the beginning of the nineteenth century appended to the Ordinal forms for the Consecration of a Church and for the Institution of Ministers. A recently proposed form of Admission to the Office of Deaconess has been dropped. Many members of the American Church have, owing to their isolation, but scanty opportunities of attending her worship, and all along she has acted wisely in providing a form of Family Prayer. To this, which breathes an atmosphere of old-fashioned domestic piety, a shorter form has now been added. There follows a series of over twenty Additional Prayers, some of which might well have been placed in a more prominent position. It is to be hoped that they will be discovered and used by many in private devotion.

* So called, but it seems to be really a cento. See Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*, *s.v.* Veni Creator.

† Procter and Frere, p. 247.

In all three books a Revised Psalter is still a desideratum. The American makes no provision for omitting parts which are not suitable for public recitation. The English and Scottish print them within not very conspicuous brackets. A note at the beginning of the Psalter explains that the bracketed passages may be omitted. The English book adds, "at the discretion of the Minister," another instance of the tendency to invest him with a power which is unwholesome for himself and confusing to his congregation. It would be better to omit the passages altogether, as in the Bishop of Truro's *Liturgical Psalter*, or to follow the Free Church Prayer Book in printing them in a different type with a note that in the public use of the Psalter they *are* to be omitted. The Free Church Book, it may be noted, makes an interesting departure by giving the Authorized Version of the Psalms pointed for chanting, with an explanatory Introduction and a short commendatory Foreword by Sir Walford Davies.

The Scottish Book ends with the Psalter. England and America continue to append the Articles, which, with some slight alterations, were adopted by the American Church in 1801. If the Prayer Book is, as it has been called, the Church's best missionary, one may doubt the wisdom of incorporating with it a document redolent of the controversies of the sixteenth century, and inevitably out of touch with the needs of today. When the somewhat slow-growing tree of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine has borne fruit, we may hope for a clear and balanced statement of the teaching of the Church, but unless all controversial matter is rigidly excluded, it had surely better be kept distinct from her manual of public worship.

An impartial survey of the Prayer Books issued by the three sister Churches would, so it seems to the present writer, place the Scottish first in richness of content, in style, and in scholarship. This may be said without any disparagement of the other two, each of which has, of course, its own special excellences.

The Episcopal Church of Scotland is a small body, which has the advantage of knowing its own mind and of inheriting a liturgical tradition. Cut off though it has been for the last three centuries from the main stream of the national life, it has produced a wonderful succession of liturgical experts, from Laud's contemporaries, Maxwell and Wedderburn, through Rattray, Falconer, and others in the eighteenth century, down to G. H. Forbes, Bishop Dowden, and the present Bishop of Moray. Their labours have resulted in a Prayer Book which is as near the ideal for an English-speaking Church as we are likely to get for some time, and is a notable contribution to the science and art of Christian worship.

J. C. Du Buisson.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

LAST month's session of the Church Assembly was responsible for two long debates dealing with the problems of Church and State and of Religious Education respectively. The issue of the former was not in doubt from the moment when the Archbishop of York concluded his speech. The motion was not an easy one to commend to a House which shrank from the possible re-opening of controversy; but the Archbishop's solid and temperate statement of the case was such that neither anxiety nor opposition had much left to say. The debate on Education was much less satisfactory, and in our judgment it was a pity that it was staged. The discussion turned almost wholly on the Cowper-Temple clause, which is not an educational principle but a political formula; and little in consequence was said about religious education. Probably the chief value of the debate lay in the glimpses it afforded of the fine work on behalf of our Church schools and Church children which is being done by Churchmen on the Local Education Authorities; and, indeed, many who were present felt that the motion should have taken the form of a vote of confidence in that work and in those who are doing it.

Among contributors to the present issue, the Rev. Lindsay Dewar is Vicar of St. Mark's, Blackburn, and the Rev. F. P. Harton is Warden of the House of the Sister of Charity at Bristol.

NOTES

1. BISHOP STUBBS ON APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

As there has been so much discussion about Apostolic Succession, it is well to recall the words of Dr. Stubbs, Bishop of Chester, 1884-1889, and of Oxford, 1889-1901, and one of the greatest of historians. His *Visitation Charges*, edited after his death by the Rev. Canon E. E. Holmes (Longmans, 1907), compare with those of Bishop Connop Thirlwall in their wise treatment of questions of the day. It will be noticed that he answers by anticipation many things that are said today. (See p. 189, in a charge delivered in 1893.)

"I will take, first, the point of the apostolic succession of the episcopate, as being an important factor in the argument of the continuous life of the English Church. And by this I mean not merely the institution of the three orders in the ministry, but the transmission of the apostolic commission from hand to hand, which is what is generally meant by the apostolic succession."

Bishop Stubbs then went on to discuss Roman Catholic objections to English Orders, Parker's consecration and so forth.

"The Puritan argument, denying altogether the need of apostolic succession, and summarily rejecting the claim of the episcopate to primitive authority or historic descent, comes to the same conclusion: there is no such thing as apostolic succession, and the whole fabric

based upon the assumption is a false pretence to authority, not only baseless itself, but used as an instrument for exclusion of faithful Christians from the privileges to which they are entitled as believers, and as a ground of persecution against those who reject the form of government to which it belongs. Then comes in the assertion of another school that the men who carried on the work of Reformation and Church government during the first age of the Reformation did not believe it themselves; and that of a diametrically opposite school, that the importance of Holy Orders in the Church of England is used as a weapon or implement to unchurch other communities of Christians, whilst the doctrine of the historic episcopate is a comparatively modern invention in relation to the Church of England, and, in fact, a figment, so far as we are concerned, of what is called the Tractarian revival."

After an excellent passage on the Roman Catholic argument, he then goes on to the Puritans.

"The arguments of the Puritans against episcopacy altogether are, of course, quite beyond a possibility of handling now: and they turn on quite a different sort of evidence. But the statements as to the historic use of the term 'apostolic succession' in the Church of England, and the modern idea of its real acceptance, may be dismissed briefly. Up to the period of the Reformation there was no other idea of episcopacy except that of transmission of apostolic commission: that the ministry of the episcopal government could be introduced without such a link was never contemplated until Bugenhagen reconstituted a nominal episcopate in Denmark, and this was an example not likely to be taken in England; nor was it so accepted. There is, then, no occasion to test the writings of the Elizabethan divines in search of traces of a belief in their own official existence. Archbishop Parker's own work on the history of the Church of England suffices to prove the importance which he attached to succession. A catena of authorities from the days of Hooker onwards is framed without much trouble. The use of the exact term apostolic succession is a matter that involves a little more research, but it is forthcoming. The work of Mason, on the English episcopate, the language of Bishop Forbes of Aberdeen, in the seventeenth century, of Bishop Beveridge, in his work on the Articles, of Law and Wesley, and of the American Prayer Book of 1805, not to speak of books that were written between 1805 and 1833, are enough to prove that there is no element of innovation or invention in question; but whether or not the two words are in common use, the writings of Mason, Jeremy Taylor, Bramhall, and Lindsay on the material point are sufficient to prove that the doctrine was definitely held. It is not to be denied that, like many other great truths which controversy has done its worst to smother, the great meaning and force both of word and thing needed, and still needs, to be more fully realized."

After the action of Bugenhagen in Schleswig (1541), the imposition of hands was disliked by many Puritans and even discarded. [See *The First Book of the Irenicon of John Forbes*, ed. E. G. Selwyn (Cambridge, 1923), p. 77, *note* 3; it was left out in the First Book of Discipline (1560), and restored in the Second (1577).] But the necessity of it being now a matter of discussion, arguments on the Apostolic Succession henceforth turned largely upon it. Much in the same way the assertion by the Gnostics of their secret tradition handed down by Christ led to the primitive appeal to the orthodox faith kept by succession of bishops in

the great sees. It was this turn of argument that emphasized succession in the episcopal office in a particular city. When the imposition of hands was brought into question the discussion of Orders took a new turn, as was natural.

J. P. WHITNEY.

---

2. THE BIRKBECK LECTURES—I

It has seemed desirable to publish a short note on the course of Mr. Z. N. Brooke's Birkbeck Lectures (Trinity College, Cambridge, 1929-31), for the double reason that the results of the lecturer's researches are of very great importance to the student of English Church History, and in particular of the relations between the English Church and the Papacy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and that it must inevitably be a considerable time before these lectures can appear in print. The following, therefore, is a brief indication of the ground covered and the points established in the three lectures delivered in the Michaelmas term of 1929.

We may be grateful for the lecturer's *caveat* against the tendency to think of the English Church in the Middle Ages as an entity in itself, and not as a part of the universal Church, and against the danger of conceiving of its relations with the Papacy as the "foreign policy" of the Church of England towards an external power.

In his first lecture Mr. Brooke exploded McKechnie's theory that the appearance of the phrase *Ecclesia Anglicana* (instead of *sancta Ecclesia*) in the opening clause of Magna Carta marks, for the first time, the emergence of a self-conscious national Church. The phrase had no such implication. It had been in use for a considerable time; since 1165 it had been gradually superseding in correspondence the older phrase, *Ecclesia Anglorum*, which goes back to the conversion of the Angles, and with which it was clearly regarded as synonymous. What is still more significant is the fact that its origin is to be found in Papal, and not in English circles. It first appears in a letter of John of Salisbury (who was in closer touch with Rome than any other man in England) of *c.* 1160-1; the second writer to employ it is Pope Alexander III. (in 1165), who uses it to describe "the Archbishops, Bishops, other prelates, and all the clergy and people in England." It would seem that its use was initiated and first established in Roman circles: the object appears to have been to bring it into line with older uses; there was, for example, an obvious clumsiness in having to write *Ecclesia Anglorum et Gallicana*. *Ecclesia Gallicana* was a phrase of considerable antiquity, and bore, at this date, no nationalist or anti-papal implications. Other countries afford similar analogies. *Sancta Ecclesia*, *Ecclesia Anglorum*, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, these phrases are in fact synonymous. It is only the Reformation that alters the whole content of the phrase *Ecclesia Anglicana*; there had been a faint prophetic hint of this new meaning in the later Middle Ages (as also in *Ecclesia Gallicana*), but there is no patriotic anti-papalism in the first clause of Magna Carta.

The second lecture was of a more general character, and sketched the course of the movement for reform of the Church in the eleventh century. Up to 1046—so long as the Papacy itself remained unreformed—the Church had no leader, and only a nominal head. There were, however, many reforming agencies at work; individual bishops were active and individual monarchs zealous. Among the latter were the Emperors

Henry II. and Henry III., and William, Duke of Normandy. It was characteristic of the reform movement during this period that it was largely dependent on the support of secular princes, and largely under their direction. It was in this spirit that William, in 1066, set about the reform of the English Church. But already, twenty years earlier, reform had reached the Papacy itself, and the centralization of the Church under papal headship was gradually being achieved. With the accession of Gregory VII. in 1073 the movement gathered momentum. Even with him, the primary object was still the reform of the Church, and the establishment of papal authority only a means to that end. But soon the position was reversed, and reform came to be pursued mainly as part of the necessary work of the Papacy. The laity were still encouraged to assist, but no longer to direct, and there was already a hint of conflict in the air; while the assertion of the supreme and universal appellate jurisdiction of the Papacy was bitterly resented by Metropolitans and Bishops. Naturally enough, during this period collections of Canon Law became of primary importance. But of these, in the period before the publication of Gratian's *Decretum* (*c.* 1150), there was a considerable variety. Some were less trustworthy than others. Moreover, different compilations represented different tendencies or different conceptions of Church government. That of Burckhardt of Worms, which was the normal text-book of ecclesiastical law in the earlier period of the movement for reform, whose characteristic temper it reflects, lays the chief stress upon episcopal authority, although, of course, admitting that the Apostolic See is "the hinge on which the whole Church turns." Later manuals, such as that of Ivo of Chartres, are more emphatically Papalist and Hildebrandine.

It is therefore of the first importance to discover precisely which collection of Canon Law was employed by Archbishop Lanfranc. In his third lecture Mr. Brooke proved conclusively that he used what was substantially (though varying in certain details from the normal type) a copy of the Pseudo-Isidore, which he had brought from Bec. The actual manuscript is now in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is in two parts: the first contains an abridgment of Papal Decretals down to the time of Gregory II., the latter an unabridged but, in some respects, unusual collection of decrees of Councils. In the first part, the pith of the collection is retained: the all-important assertions of Papal authority are intact. This was not, indeed, the section in which Lanfranc was primarily interested. He had sent for this manuscript from Bec (since he found none in England) in order to study the nature and extent of his authority as Primate and Metropolitan as established by the Canon Law, and the relevant passages are marked by an "A" in the margin, which may be taken as standing for the word *Auctoritas*. These are the passages which Lanfranc quotes in his letters as need arises. At his instigation, copies of this manuscript were quickly and widely circulated. And this was pregnant with momentous consequences for the future; for students of this collection who were not reading it, as Lanfranc read it, with a particular end in view, were bound to be impressed, not so much by the features that had interested the Archbishop, as by those which had not interested him, namely, the emphatic assertions of Papal authority contained in the Decretals (some genuine, some forged) which dominate the whole collection.

C. H. Smyth.

3. "INFALLIBILITY" AND "INDEFECTIBILITY"

Discussing the recently published answer to Father Vernon's *apologia*, and the views on the subject of the authority of the Church put forward therein by the joint authors, the Editorial of the February number of THEOLOGY suggests that the word "indefectibility" is more suitable than "infallibility" for use in this connection.

An interesting sidelight is thrown on the use of these two words by a, perhaps, not very well-known account of a certain discussion which was part of the preliminaries to the drawing up of the famous "Déclaration du clergé de France sur la puissance ecclésiastique" in 1682—commonly known as the "Four Articles." This discussion, between the Bishops of Tournai and Meaux, took place in the "Commission des Six Articles de Sorbonne," which had been set up as one of the committees of the "Assemblée générale du Clergé de France." The official minutes of this "commission" were apparently destroyed, but an account of some of its proceedings has come down to us in a somewhat roundabout way. It is to be found in Emery, *Nouveaux Opuscules de Fleury*, where Fleury quotes from Fénelon's work, *De Summi Pontificis auctoritate*, a description of what took place, given by Bossuet himself in the course of a conversation with Fénelon, as follows:

"M. Bossuet, évêque de Meaux, mort depuis peu de temps, m'a souvent raconté, en présence de témoins dignes de foi, ce qui s'était passé dans l'assemblée générale du clergé de France en 1682, et voici une des particularités de sa narration:

"M. de Choiseul-Praslin, évêque de Tournai, avait été choisi pour dresser la déclaration du clergé de France sur l'autorité du Pape. Il la dressa; ou la lut; et aussitôt l'évêque de Meaux s'éleva contre elle avec force, parce qu'elle portait que le siège apostolique, aussi bien que les personnes des Papes, pouvaient devenir hérétiques. 'Mais si vous ne convenez pas de ce point,' disait l'évêque de Tournai, 'vous êtes forcé de reconnaître l'*infaillibilité* du Pape.' L'évêque de Meaux répliquait: 'Vous ne pouvez pas nier que la foi de Pierre ne manquera jamais dans son siège: cela est ouvertement renfermé dans les promesses, et toute la tradition rend à cette vérité le témoignage le plus évident.' 'Si cela est ainsi,' répliquait l'évêque de Tournai, 'il faut accorder l'*infaillibilité* la plus absolue, sinon à l'homme assis dans le siège, du moins au siège, et par conséquent il faut avouer que tous les décrets qui émanent du Saint-Siège sont entièrement irréformables et appuyés sur une autorité infaillible.' L'évêque de Meauz tâchait de résoudre ainsi l'objection: 'La foi de ce siège est *indéfectible*, il est vrai, et cependant ses jugements ne sont pas *infaillibles*.' 'Comment prouveriez vous,' disait l'évêque de Tournai, 'que la foi de ce siège est *indéfectible*?' 'Je le prouve,' disait l'évêque de Meaux, 'par les promesses de N.-S. . . .'

"L'évêque de Tournai répondait: '. . . Cet argument, de votre aveu, ne prouve rien, parce qu'il prouve trop. . . .' L'évêque de Meaux répondait: 'Je vous avertis encore une fois qu'il faut distinguer l'*infaillibilité* des jugements dans l'enseignement de la foi d'avec l'*indéfectibilité* du siège dans le maintien de la foi; or la foi de ce siège est *indéfectible*, ainsi qu'il est manifeste par les promesses de J.-C. et la tradition de l'Église; mais les jugements de ce siège ne sont pas *infaillibles*.' 'O chose vraiment incroyable!' s'écriait l' évêque de Tournai. '. . .

Assurément, sous ce nom adouci d'*indéfectibilité*, vous nous insinuez cette même *infaillibilité* des ultramontains, que vous niez. . . . Assignez donc précisément et nettement en quoi peuvent différer votre *indéfectibilité* et l'*infaillibilité* ultramontaine. . . .'" (A long and reasoned argument by the Bishop of Meaux follows, and he closes thus:) "'. . . Ainsi, en soutenant l'*indéfectibilité*, je ne fais que m'attacher pleinement aux paroles très-expresses de la promesse, et cependant je n'admets pas cette *infaillibilité* prétendue des ultramontains.'

"A la fin de cette contestation entre les deux évêques, celui de Tournai se désista de la commission qui lui avait été donnée de rédiger la déclaration des sentiments du clergé de France. L' évêque de Meaux en fut chargé, et aussitôt il écrivit les quatre propositions, telles que nous les avons."

If further examples of the use of these two words should be desired, recourse may be had to Bossuet, *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, Book X., chaps. xxxiii., xxxiv., and ff., especially in the French version (equally with the Latin, the work of Bossuet), where he constantly uses and contrasts the words *infaillibilité* and *indéfectibilité* (ed. 1745, t. iii., p. 169 ff.).

L. C. R. SMITH.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Harvard Theological Review. April, 1929.

PROF. BACON studies the "Canonization of Matthew," on the same lines as Canon Streeter in his *The Four Gospels*, accepting the Syriac fragment dating from *c.* 400 A.D. as evidence that a synod was held at Rome in 119 A.D. to decide about the gospel ascribed to Matthew which had recently come to Rome, and the teaching of which about the Virgin Birth and the Magi had been advocated by the famous martyr Ignatius. The longest article is by R. H. BAINTON on Luther's attitude toward religious liberty. CHARLES BRUSTON studies the Serâbît Inscriptions on Mt. Sinai and concludes that the language is virtually identical with Hebrew. E. R. GOODENOUGH has a most interesting note on Philemon. Throughout the Eastern half of the Empire a slave in danger of his life could take refuge at the hearth of any householder, who was bound to give sanctuary and either to persuade him to return or else sell him and pay the owner the price received. The price of a runaway slave was low, and as he was generally bought for the galleys or the mines he could generally be induced to return to his master. Onesimus, having defrauded his master, fled to Paul, who was obviously at liberty—"prisoner of Christ" must be taken as having a sense akin to "slave of Christ." Paul, according to the law, kept him for a time, during which Onesimus became a Christian. Paul urged on Philemon that Onesimus was a changed man and appealed to the master to forego his wrath. Even so he had to go bond for the lost money.

Les deux auteurs des Actes des Apôtres, by P.-L. Couchoud and R. Stahl (reprinted from *La Revue de l'histoire des religions*. Jan., 1928. Paris). In this interesting monograph Loisy's theory of two authors of the Acts is worked out in the light of linguistic peculiarities. The first author, A, tells the story of St. Paul's life; he is well informed as re-

gards the sea, the political affairs of the Levant, and the Hellenistic origins of the Church of Antioch. Author B is a hagiographer, saturated in the Greek Bible. He is responsible for the early chapters; he has also incorporated the work of A, editing it freely with conventional and edifying touches. The chief linguistic proofs are these: A writes *Ἱεροσόλυμα*, the Greek declinable plural, B *Ἱερουσαλήμ*, the Hebrew and LXX form of the word. A has (*ἡ*) *Λύστρα*, B (*τὰ*) *Λύστρα*. A has *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* for semi-proselytes, B *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν*. A writes "the word of the Lord," B "the word of God." "Apostles" in A has the sense found in the Pauline Epistles, in B the ecclesiastical sense of The Twelve. There are also doctrinal differences in the use of such words as "spirit," "resurrection," "eternal life." The interpolations are in places very obvious. When the authors conclude by suggesting that A may be Marcion, who was a sailor, and B Clement, author of *Prima Clementis*, which is dated about 140 A.D., the reader may dismiss the thesis as ridiculous. This would be a pity. There are many unsolved problems in Acts—we have only to think of the puzzles the Third Gospel would present if it had no companions to realize this—and our authors have at least stated the problem in an arresting form. Some of their data depend on an eclectic use of such a text, Western or non-Western, as best suits their thesis, but a good deal remains cogent. Conservative theologians explain much of it by laying stress on the influence of sources and the obvious neglect of the author to revise his work finally. But the main argument of Loisy's theory, namely the correspondence of the early chapters of Acts with the atmosphere and thought of I Clement, demands more study. Are these chapters really primitive, or do they come from a relatively late period which retained a naïve Christology unaffected by Paulinism?

W. K. L. C.

Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society. Vol. ix., Nos. 3 and 4.

In this double number a recent address of the Director of the Department of Antiquities, Jerusalem, outlines the new law for the protection of archæological sites. Unauthorized search for antiquities is forbidden, and no licence to excavate will be granted except to qualified individuals or bodies. The reporting of chance finds is encouraged by providing for the rewarding of the finder, while the Government shows its readiness to welcome foreign assistance by the offering of favourable terms regarding the objects found.

Dr. T. Canaan in his studies in the Topography and Folklore of Petra collects some interesting information about the Bedouin there. When they move their tents to fresh encampments they kill a sheep or a goat for the "owner of the place." A goat or female sheep is killed at the completion of the building of a house (1 Kings xvi. 34). With the blood they sprinkle the two sides and the upper lintel of the door (Exod. xii. 22; Heb. xi. 28). Eclipses of the sun or moon are believed to be caused by a sea monster trying to swallow up the sun or moon; see this frequent reference to Rahab, the sea monster, in the Old Testament—Job ix. 13, xxvi. 12; Psa. lxxxix. 10; Isa. li. 9. The most important saint at Petra is *Hârûn*, whose shrine is on the high mountain of Hor. Here, according to one tradition, his spirit hovered above the mountains of Petra until his body was buried by Moses.

Dr. A. E. Mader contributes an illustrated article on some finds at the ruins of Khirbet el Mera, believed to be the monastery founded by St. Sabbas in A.D. 492. R. D. MIDDLETON.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xx., No. 3.

Dr. C. Duschinsky gives a useful account of Rabbi David Oppenheimer (1664-1736), a great Rabbinical scholar and writer, for some years chief Rabbi of Prague, and also of the Kingdom of Bohemia. Oppenheimer was the first great collector of a Hebrew library. His collections in 1715 consisted of 7,000 printed volumes and 1,000 manuscripts, a large part of which is now the property of the Bodleian library.

Colonel H. Biddulph contributes a note on the accent Paseq which has always been a puzzle to Hebrew scholars (*cf.* Gesenius Kautzsch, § 15 f., Note 2, Cobb Hebrew Metre, p. 165). He suggests that it has survived from a former word and verse division of ancient Hebrew MSS.

Professor Jacob Hoschander, reviewing Hans Duhm's *Der Verkehr Gottes mit den Mensehen im Alten Testament*, rightly protests against the latter's description of post-exilic Judaism: "The Jewish religion becomes stunted and finally freezes into Talmud-Judaism." A brief perusal of the Jewish Prayer Book (The Authorized Daily Prayer Book, Eyre and Spottiswoode) is sufficient to prove the untruth of such assertions, and Professor Hoschander not inaptly remarks: "But we should think that this frozen Jewish religion is incomparably superior to the religious conceptions of modern spiritual leaders who consider themselves Christians in good standing and proclaim Christianity as the acme of belief, and yet maintain that religion is a purely human product invented for the needs of humanity, as the author himself testifies! Talmud-Judaism can never sink to such a level." R. D. MIDDLETON.

Theologische Blätter. January.

Prof. P. Althaus offers certain criticisms of F. Spemann's *Theological Confessions*, which deal with Lutheranism and other theological questions. Pastor G. Dehn writes on "The Sense of Evangelical Preaching." Prof. C. Piper discusses the world-view of modern Catholicism. L. P.

Anglican Theological Review. Vol. xii., No. 3. Jan., 1930.

The position of honour in this number is given to an article by Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed on "The Place of Ephesians in the First Pauline Collection." Prof. Goodspeed has already put out, in his *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*, the argument that it was the appearance of the Acts about the year A.D. 90 which created a popular interest in St. Paul sufficient to induce someone to collect and publish his letters. In this first Pauline collection there were letters to Seven Churches—Philemon being the Epistle to the Laodiceans. This Corpus accounts for a new type of literature in the Primitive Church, the Letters to the Seven Churches of the Revelation, the Letters of St. John and St. Ignatius, and the Pastorals. To this theory of Prof. Goodspeed, Prof. A. von Harnack replied in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of March 17, 1928 (vol. 53, cols. 124-128). In the present article Prof. Goodspeed makes his answers to Prof. A. von Harnack's objections, and deals particularly with the

problem of Ephesians. This he regards as pseudepigraphic, written as an encyclical "to introduce the collection of individual church letters to all Christians everywhere. Its copious use of Colossians is altogether natural if it was written in Asia."

This number also contains "Thoughts on Hosea," by Fleming Jones, and "Comments on the Fourth Gospel," by Clayton R. Bowen. The former of these two articles insists that Hosea did not discover the love of God through the misery and love of his married life, but, on the other hand, sacrificed his own happiness in order to live out before the public eye a parable of the love of God for his people. Thus, without being a Barthian, Fleming Jones illustrates that reaction to the insistence on the objective reality of God of which Karl Barth is the prophet.

J. O. C.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

The January number opens with Father Ghellinck's learned appreciation of the dialectic of Aristotle during the Trinitarian conflicts of the fourth century. This is but one phase of the contact between triumphant Christianity and its ancient adversary, Hellenism. Father de Lacger begins an important survey of the Primacy and the metropolitan power of the Archbishop of Bourges in that singularly seminal age, the thirteenth century. Father Teetaert prints a compendium of pastoral theology of the thirteenth to fourteenth century: it is essentially a dialogue concerning the seven sacraments. Father Perroy deals with an Urbanist Bishop, one Guillaume de Coundenberghe. This Bishop of Tournai and of Bâle enjoyed the protection of England. Father Debongnie describes an unknown witness in favour of the claims of St. Thomas à Kempis. He believes that this anonymous writer furnishes an early—perhaps the first—link in the chain of confused tradition which in Bavaria marks out Thomas à Kempis as the author of the *Imitatio Christi*. We are filled with renewed admiration for the reviews and, above all, for the notices of the contents of the learned periodicals of Europe.

R. H. M.

REVIEWS

REUNION PROJECTS

Church Union in South India. By E. H. M. Waller, Bishop of Madras. S.P.C.K. 2s.

The Case for Episcopacy. By Kenneth D. Mackenzie. S.P.C.K. Paper, 2s. 6d. net. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

Christian Reunion in Ecumenical Light. By F. J. Hall, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Everything said or written about the Scheme of Union in South India by the men who have been actually taking part in shaping it reflects the fire of the Holy Spirit, and the Bishop of Madras's little book is no exception. As he describes the vision of union and the paralysis of disunion, our mind is kindled to sympathy and shame. As he tells the story of the way the proposals have reached their present form we are assured that he "loves the truth and peace." He does not skate over the difficult places; he stops and warns us of them, and makes it clear why they are difficult and how they have come to be less difficult than they were. His faith helps us to believe that if they cannot be overcome this year, they *will* be overcome in God's time; and that we are in this process of union sharers in the purpose of God which will in the end prove victorious.

It must be a constant temptation to those working in South India to sacrifice principle to expediency, especially when it is not always easy to discriminate what principle, if any, is at stake behind any given Church rule, and when expediency is impatient of delay.

Obviously the impatience of Indians with the unhappy divisions which they did not create and do not desire to perpetuate must weigh heavily in the negotiations, but this impatience, perhaps, needs further analysis. It may arise from ignorance of the principles at stake, or it may arise from a conviction that the so-called principles at stake are intrinsically unimportant and unreal, or at least unreal for India.

In so far as it is of this latter kind, it must challenge us of the West to examine the basic principles of Churchmanship, but it should also remind us of our responsibility to the East. Indian thought is singularly lacking in historic sense, and inclined to belittle the historic basis of Christianity. Historical Christianity is actually at work in Churches with their roots in history, and these roots cannot be ignored. There is an appeal

to history which is paralyzing to the present work of the Spirit. But the historicity of the Church is a vital principle which must be safeguarded in the interests of Indian Christianity.

A solemn responsibility is evidently laid upon every thoughtful Christian persistently to explore the means by which the intolerable sore of disunion can be healed. Mr. Mackenzie's book is not primarily concerned with reunion, but "aims rather at concentrating attention on one of the subjects which must be studied before we are in a position to deal with reunion at all." That subject is episcopacy.

For such a task honesty, charity, and accurate knowledge are required, and are notably displayed in this book.

It may be that the discussion of the validity of a ministry makes Dr. Stanley Jones and others yawn (p. 132), but it is foolish to ignore the fact that there is a difference between the Catholic and the Protestant view of the ministry, and that it is the conception of validity which is distinctive of Catholic thought. And the question of validity is intimately bound up with that of Episcopacy.

Mr. Mackenzie's treatment of this theme is informing, scholarly, and fair, and should help readers to appreciate that the Catholic stand for an episcopate based on the Apostolic Successions has safeguarded the continuity and unity of the Church, and the transcendent element in authority.

The book begins with a careful survey of the evidence concerning the nature and function of the ministry in the Apostolic Age, and the Age of the Fathers.

Mr. Mackenzie has carefully digested Dr. Streeter's book on *The Primitive Church*, and draws upon it with discrimination. His account of Church Order in the first century may not be so brilliant in "scientific guesses" as that of Dr. Streeter, but it commends itself for its sober adherence to the evidence.

There follows an admirable exposition of the nature of the Episcopal Office.

The chapter entitled "Some other Theories of the Ministry" invites the question, What, then, is the theory to which the writer himself adheres? Implicitly, no doubt, it is clear that it is the Augustinian theory, commonly accepted as "Catholic," which he himself accepts; but it would perhaps have been advisable to state this more clearly and fully.

In writing of the spiritual value of the Catholic conception of Order, Mr. Mackenzie concludes that it safeguards the sense of "creatureliness" of the minister and the all-sufficiency of God. "There is no meaning," he writes, "in the Catholic insistence on valid Ordination, except acknowledgment of human weakness and dependence upon God."

There is a short appendix to show the bearing of the argument of the book upon the South India Proposals.

It is doubtful whether episcopacy can be fruitfully discussed without closer attention to the doctrine of the Church than Mr. Mackenzie gives to it. It is this omission which explains certain flaws. There are, for example, curious ambiguities about the mission (the *sent-ness*) of the ministry. There are several suggestions that "mission" is a differentia of the Catholic as against the Protestant idea of the ministry (pp. 8, 25, 132). This would be disputed by many Nonconformists. In one passage (p. 26) the ministry is spoken of as "sent to" the Church. But surely the Catholic conception is that the ministry is sent "into all the world" by Christ at work through His Spirit in and with His Church.

There are phrases which are perilously near to shibboleths. "Ministry is from above, not from below" (p. 26). "A fruitful ministry must normally have the original Apostolic grace transmitted to it" (p. 27). "From the beginning the principle has been that of delegation" (p. 40).

Mr. Mackenzie would have done well to include in his "other theories" of the ministry the plea put forward by Canon Quick in *The Christian Sacraments* for a return to the Cyprianic theory adapted to the present situation. Even if he did not agree with it, the fact of having to criticize it would have helped him to clarify his own exposition.

There is a real danger of making the validity of the Church depend on the validity of the ministry. Scripture and reason alike proclaim that the doctrine of the Church is logically prior to the doctrine of the ministry, and it is a doctrine of the Church that we need.

In Dr. Hall's little volume we have a masterly book on Reunion, notable alike for its splendid faith in "the power of God to guard and guide," and for its firm candour in relation to existing facts.

The writer's aim is to "clear the way for a fresh study of the questions which now divide Christians," and "by emphasizing the world-wide scope of the problem of unity," to plead for its consideration "in the light of principles which now control, and from the beginning have controlled, the outlook of the major part of Christendom." "It is impossible," he says, "to develop fully and widely the higher and more balanced aspects and elements of spiritual outlook and practice in mutually isolated and critically watchful organizations."

He is deeply convinced of the solemn responsibility which is laid upon Anglicanism in the cause of Reunion, and thinks that Anglo-Catholicism "represents a recovery of the most

abiding and most determinative Anglican tradition"; but he is obviously disturbed by the lapse into ambiguous language into which the Lambeth Conference of 1920 was lured (see pp. 25, 29, 59, 89-90).

There are admirable things said about priesthood, the Catholic rule of faith, creeds and confessions, authority and freedom. He clearly brings out the true aim of the Lausanne Conference as *educative*, and is emphatic in declaring that "our conferences should not be embarrassed by forcing the pace with premature proposals."

Under the heading "Requirements for Reunion" three principles are laid down and discussed: (*a*) That nothing short of corporate union of all Christian Communions fully agrees with the mind of Christ; (*b*) that all smaller unions, and all schemes and arrangements leading thereto, should be consistent with progress towards this goal; (*c*) that no schematic action should be taken which is likely to create new obstacles to the final reunion of Christendom.

The book concludes with critical comments on the scheme for the mutual recognition of ministries proposed by Dr. Headlam in his Bampton Lectures, and on the South India Proposals; and a brilliant review of Dr. Streeter's *Primitive Church*.

Every page is packed with sound learning and good sense. It is by far the weightiest of the books written to prepare the mind of the Church for the coming Lambeth Conference that has yet appeared.

E. R. MORGAN.

ARCHBISHOP BERNARD'S COMMENTARY ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.*

With a note on the republication of the lectures delivered in 1907 by the present Dean of Wells on the "Historical Character of St. John's Gospel."†

During the whole period from the publication of Westcott's Commentary on St. John's Gospel to the present day only two considerable books on the Fourth Gospel have been produced for English readers. Both of these have been published quite recently, and both were written by men of great scholarly attainments at the close of long and active lives. This is in itself a fact of some significance, because it means that during the past generation the Fourth Gospel has been, on the whole, neglected by English scholars, or at least that they have not felt sufficiently certain to commit their opinions to print, the energy of

* *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, by Archbishop J. H. Bernard. ("The International Critical Commentary," T. and T. Clark, 1928.)

† *The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel*, by J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., F.B.A., 2nd edition, enlarged. Longmans, Green & Co., 1929.

N.T. exegesis being devoted primarily to the analysis of the Synoptic Gospels or to the interpretation of the Pauline Epistles. More significant still is the complete disagreement between the two scholars who did finally grapple with the Fourth Gospel. Estlin Carpenter* found the Fourth Gospel to move in a world in which history melts into symbols and symbols into unseen reality (see pp. 242-253 and 376-385); Archbishop Bernard, on the other hand, found the Fourth Gospel to consist of authentic historical reminiscences of the Apostle John, to which were added the interpretations of that other John, the Presbyter, who also saw the Lord *in the flesh*. For Archbishop Bernard the Fourth Gospel records the history of Jesus, and supplements the narrative of the Synoptic Gospels by adding to the history; for Estlin Carpenter it records the beliefs of Hellenistic Christians at the end of the N.T. period, and from time to time betrays the origin of these beliefs in the forms of non-Christian piety current at that period (see especially pp. 277-284, 380). The complete disagreement between these two scholars brings into clear prominence the uncertainty of treatment of the Johannine Writings which the older generation has left us as a heritage. There is a further distinction between the two books. Estlin Carpenter gave us what is really a series of essays; the Archbishop has left behind him a complete and detailed commentary. This means that, whereas we know the grounds, the detailed grounds, of the Archbishop's judgments, we are not so certain why Estlin Carpenter reached the conclusions he finally arrived at. Consequently, the commentary must be used continuously by anyone who is working seriously upon the Fourth Gospel; but it may be doubted whether the essays can ever provide so constant a companion to its interpretation.

The commentary consists of two volumes comprising in all 740 pages+188 pages of introduction, and is furnished with three *indices*—a general index, an index of authors and writings, and an index of Greek words. The commentary on the *Pericope de Adultera* is printed in small type at the conclusion of vol. ii. (pp. 715-721). The Archbishop's work is marked throughout by certain well-defined characteristics. He pays careful attention to variant readings. The readings of ω and Θ are noted throughout, and this is important for those who do not possess the collation of the Washington MS. by H. A. Sanders or the edition of the Koridethi MS. by Beermann and Gregory. Strangely enough, the readings of the Bible Society's Coptic MS., edited by Sir H. Thompson in 1924, do not seem to have been noted, though the MS. is referred to in the Introduction (p. xvi).

* *The Johannine Writings: A Study of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel*, by J. Estlin Carpenter, D.D., D.Litt. Constable and Co., 1927.

The Archbishop is scrupulous in his attention to grammatical details and to the exact meaning of words, and he is wholly aware of the danger of forcing upon the author of the Fourth Gospel the subtleties of classical idiom (see note on vi. 71 and Additional Note, pp. 702 *ff.*). The reader of the commentary is never overwhelmed by undisciplined catenas of irrelevant parallels from the sphere of comparative religion. The references are primarily Biblical references, with which are combined references to the Apostolic Fathers and to Irenæus. This asceticism has its reward, for again and again it is shown that the LXX provides the key to the exegesis of this or that passage (*e.g.*, note on p. 283), and at crucial points it is in the Epistles of Ignatius that the nearest parallel appears (see note on vi. 54 *ff.*, p. 211, and Introduction, pp. clxviii *f.*). The judgment "I have found the writings of Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus more valuable than any of the set commentaries of the Fathers" is a judgment of first-rate importance. The Archbishop does not reserve his decision as to the meaning of difficult passages, and therefore gives his readers a very clear lead. Occasionally the opinions of others are almost angrily dismissed (*e.g.*, p. 144, at the end of the first paragraph). His comments are often admirable in their conciseness, and he shows a power of seizing upon difficulties and clearing them up, for which the reader will be rightly grateful (*e.g.*, the note on v. 39).

The long Introduction contains sections of great value. It is good to have the case against the early martyrdom of the Apostle John stated fully and in an accessible form (pp. xxxvii-xlv; the argument is, in the main, a recapitulation of the article originally printed in *Studia Sacra*, pp. 260 *ff.*). The evidence for the existence of a second John at Ephesus is most carefully handled, and shown to be supported only by the Papias passage. The Archbishop regards this as wholly sufficient evidence; but he has set out the problem with exemplary clarity (pp. xlv-lv). The Presbyter remains a very obscure figure. Two of the Archbishop's judgments about him seem difficult to reconcile. On p. lxxx he writes: the Evangelist "relies on Palestinian tradition or on a Palestinian Jew (if he had not himself been in Palestine, which is quite possible) for his native names. . . . But we must not infer that his knowledge of Aramaic went very far, or that he was a native speaker." On p. cix he writes: the Evangelist "is not only an historian: he is an interpreter of history. And, moreover, he himself was one of the first disciples, although not of the inner circle; he had heard Jesus speak, and he knew how he was accustomed to speak, when in controversy with Jewish opponents, no less than in

His discourse with simple people." The Introduction contains a valuable analysis of the significance of the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι (pp. cxvi-cxxi), and a summary of the use of the title "Son of Man" in the various strata of the Gospels is given on pp. cxxii-cxxxiii, which will be found useful for those working on the Synoptic Gospels. Occasionally opinions are shyly hinted at which are difficult to understand, and even more difficult to accept. He suggests, for example, on p. ci, that the Evangelist in i. 15 is following *Q*, and that in addition to his use of Mark, John uses Luke, *or perhaps we should say uses Q* (p. xcvi). If the Archbishop really considered there is evidence that John knew and used *Q as a distinct document*, or was able to distinguish the *Q* material in the Lucan Gospel, this would be so important a conclusion that we want the grounds very clearly stated; but we are left with little more than a mere assertion. A rather obscure piece of exegesis is hinted at also on p. cii. The question, *The baptism of John, was it from heaven?* (Mark xi. 30, Luke xx. 5, Matt. xxi. 25) is said to prove "decisively that the Baptist had proclaimed Jesus as the Expected One." The word "decisively" seems a very strong word. These are, however, details which do not affect the excellence of the commentary considered as a whole.

The Archbishop then adopts throughout the technique of historical criticism, and his competent procedure marks the mature scholar who has long been accustomed to the use of critical methods. In the arrangement of the book there are two omissions. There is no complete bibliography, and there is no index to the Additional Notes which are inserted at various points in the commentary, and are exceedingly difficult to find.

Thus far reference has been made only to the technical and exegetical excellence of the commentary, which means that it is valuable for those who are engaged in a detailed and independent study of the Fourth Gospel. A more serious question arises as to the general view of the Fourth Gospel and of its place in Primitive Christian literature which is represented in the commentary. A final judgment as to the value of such a commentary depends on the extent to which it provides an adequate explanation of the Gospel *as a whole*.

The Archbishop's explanation of the Fourth Gospel rests upon a distinction between the "Witness," who is the Apostle John, and the "Evangelist," who is the Presbyter John, a disciple of the Apostle and himself an original disciple of Jesus. The Gospel therefore contains two elements: the original reminiscences of the Apostle, and the interpretations of the Evangelist, who "put into shape" the reminiscences of his teacher. The Archbishop does not mean by this that the

reminiscences merely lie behind the work of the Evangelist; the reminiscences exist in the Gospel, and the Evangelist adds interpretations to them or effects some alteration, or adds a gloss, to the sayings of Jesus which the Apostle remembered. Thus, for example, the commentary on chap. iv. proceeds on the assumption that we have before us a "genuine reminiscence of an incident that actually happened." When, however, the final confession of the Samaritans is reached, *This is indeed the Saviour of the world*, the Archbishop comments, "That the Samaritan villagers rose to the conception of Jesus not only as Messiah, but as 'the Saviour of the world,' is not probable. This great title reflects the conviction of a later moment in Christian history and of a more fully instructed faith." Or, again, the words *of water* in the saying, *Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God* (iii. 5), are stated to be a gloss added by the Evangelist to bring the saying of Jesus into "harmony with the belief and practice of a later generation," because the words *of water* introduce a reference to Christian baptism. This insistence on the importance of verbal reminiscence and of a clear recollection of the details of the history involves for the Archbishop the existence in the Fourth Gospel of a real chronology and of a correct historical sequence of events, and forces upon him the necessity of an elaborate reordering of the sequence of the chapters in the Gospel as it stands. The Gospel, he maintains, and indeed is forced to maintain, has suffered considerable dislocation, by which the history has been disturbed. Consequently, he proposes the following rearrangements (pp. xvi-xxx), and comments on the Gospel as he has rearranged it—chaps. iv., vi., v., vii. 15-24, vii. 1-14, 25-52—xiii. 1-30, xv., xvi., xiii. 31-38, xiv., xvii. In chaps. iii. and xii. the following rearrangements are also adopted: iii. 19-29, 1-18, 30 *ff.*—xii. 1-36*a*, 44-50, 36*b*-43. All these rearrangements are demanded by the assumption that the Fourth Gospel must have been originally constructed out of the memory of connected happenings, and out of discourses the sequence of which is not literary but historical.

The distinction between the Witness and the Evangelist is, then, fundamental in the commentary. Indeed, it is upon this distinction that the whole commentary moves. The Gospel is History and Interpretation; not history interpreted, but history *and* interpretation. It is true that the Archbishop recognizes overlapping. He writes: "It is not to be overlooked, moreover, that in these reports the commentary cannot always be distinguished from the sayings of Jesus which he (the Evangelist) has set down." It is precisely here that the query must be put. Can they ever be distinguished? Can we ever in reading the

Fourth Gospel distinguish between the Witness and the Evangelist? The weakness of the commentary is that it introduces into a Gospel which is all of one piece a distinction which destroys the unity both of the whole and of each section. It was the clear recognition of this unity which gave permanent value to Westcott's Commentary. In the present commentary this unity has been lost, and no skill in exegesis can compensate for the loss. For example, chap. iv. is one complete whole in which the narrative is carefully built up in order to reach the confession of the Samaritans; the words to Nicodemus in chap. iii. are set in a framework controlled by the significance of water. It seems impossible to treat the words *of water* as a gloss, or to detach the confession of the Samaritans as though it were added to a record complete without it. The truth would seem to be that throughout the Gospel the interpretation, which is complete and all-embracing, has taken charge of the older material, and the question must be raised as to whether the purpose of the book is at all to provide a chronology of events or to add interpretations at certain points in the narrative, or whether the word "gloss" is in any sense adequate to describe the procedure of the Evangelist. It looks as though the purpose of the Evangelist was to illustrate and expound great themes fundamental to the understanding of the Christian Religion, and that the Gospel is wholly exposition. If this be so, the elaborate theory of dislocations in the text requires reconsideration, and much else in the commentary also requires reconsideration.

To sum up. We are indebted to the Archbishop for a valuable commentary on the text of the Gospel, and for much that stands in the long Introduction to the Gospel. But it may be doubted whether his theory of its composition, and, consequently, of its place in Primitive Christian literature, can be held to be adequate.

A note may be added here on the republication by the Dean of Wells of the three lectures delivered twenty-one years ago in Westminster Abbey on the "Historical Character of St. John's Gospel," to which was originally added a note on the "Alleged Martyrdom of St. John the Apostle," and to which is now added a lecture delivered in Manchester Cathedral in 1922 on the "Present Value of the Fourth Gospel." The Dean has made no alteration in the text of his original lectures, and he stands by his original opinion that the Fourth Gospel is the interpretation of "the meaning and scope of our Lord's mission," and that it was written in his old age by the Apostle John. In his Manchester lecture he dismisses the Presbyter quite shortly and firmly. "The dim figure of 'John the Presbyter' at

Ephesus makes no appeal to me; and I cannot conceive that the Church could have been led to confuse him with St. John the Apostle and the writer of the Fourth Gospel. That mole never made such a mountain. A great mind and a great experience, an intimate discipleship, and a long life of brooding over the amazing events of the world's greatest tragedy—nothing else can afford, to my mind, a tolerable account of how this book came into existence" (p. 102). Thus the Dean avoids the division which the Archbishop finds in the Gospel. But the Dean has given us only these rather slight lectures, and it is difficult to accept his explanation except on the basis of a complete commentary.

EDWYN C. HOSKYNS.

NOTICES

ESSENTIALS AND NON-ESSENTIALS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By J. M. Shaw, D.D. T. and T. Clark. 5s.

In this reliable and interesting volume will be found effective criticism of, and reply to, Tennessee fundamentalism. Very fair to his opponents, Dr. Shaw discloses the amazing fallacies of some things which we had hoped were well outworn. On the constructive side also he makes some good points. Many will, however, consider that the author does not strengthen his position by his extreme distrust of careful theological interpretations. After all, there are vast metaphysical implications in the one fundamental acknowledgement Ἰησοῦς Κύριος.

F. W. BUTLER.

ROLLE AND "OUR DAILY WORK." By Geraldine Hodgson, Litt.D. Faith Press. 3s.

"Our Daily Work," which is a brief ascetic guide to the life of the Christian in the world, appears in whole in the Arundel MS. and in part in the MS. made by Robert Thornton, now in the library of Lincoln. Translations of the two texts are here set out side by side, after an introductory chapter in which Dr. Hodgson discusses the relation between asceticism and mysticism, and some notes follow. The appearance of the book is due to a difference of opinion as to its authorship. Dr. Horstman considered that it "can safely be ascribed to R. Rolle." Miss Hope Allen recently disputed his opinion, mainly on the ground that the book shows "an essential divergence from his experience," contradicting his teaching as to the abiding character of mystic communion. Dr. Hodgson in turn finds Miss Allen's argument inconclusive and unconvincing; and, on the strength of a considerable knowledge of Rolle's mind, she reasserts his authorship in the decidedly interesting final chapter of a small book which all lovers of English mystical literature will care to possess.

O. HARDMAN.

ORTHODOX RELIGION IN THE LIGHT OF TODAY. By E. H. Archer-Shepherd. Rivingtons. 18s.

The Vicar of Avenbury has for many years filled in many of his leisure hours with sustained study, and we see the profitable fruits thereof

in this large volume. It is a work of distinct ability. It covers a wide field—on science and religion, on Christian doctrines, on O.T. interpretation. Throughout it is characterized by genuine scholarship clearly expressed and in touch with contemporary problems. It will be read with profit by all those who aim at understanding Christianity in its present appeal. The chapters on the Pentateuch and on the Ritual of the Tabernacle call for special mention, and a chapter on the Idea of God in Israel will repay close attention.

F. W. Butler.

The Masterful Monk. By Owen Francis Dudley. Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd. 3s. 6d. and 5s.

There is a great deal to be said for making the attempt to present the Catholic standpoint of sexual morality in a novel, but there is not much to be said for this particular attempt. It would have been better either as straightforward propaganda, or as a novel without an axe to grind. As a novel with a purpose it is not even good of its kind. It is in the manner of R. H. Benson, but not his best manner, and without his spiritual insight. The characters are drawn as unrelieved extremes of virtue or vice, and most of the situations are rather childishly melodramatic. The conversations are in the style of the more elaborate advertisements—the Monk himself being first cousin to Mr. Drage.

V. I. Ruffer.

Vox Domini. By Clement Humilis. Mowbray. 12s. 6d.

This is a remarkable book, written in the form of supposed messages from the Master to men and women of today. It is not only devotional in form, but most devout in tone throughout, such a book as would be expected from the humble mind of "a Parish Priest" who can speak of it as "translated from the ineffable." The three books of colloquies, or rather messages, of which it consists are an expression of the Master's words with which it opens:

> "The root of the Faith is two-fold:
> 'God in Me': which men call the Incarnation;
> And 'I in thee': which is the Blessed Sacrament,
> The secret dwelling of Myself in human hearts."

It is difficult to criticize so sincere and devout a book, and parts of it are of real spiritual value, especially the seventy-six chapters of Book II. on "The Evangelical Life of the Soul." But such a book is a help to the devotional side of us only as long as it does not arouse the critical side too. A reader whose views are exactly in accord with "Clement Humilis" will be carried through the book without any thought that he is being indirectly taught a particular theology, or that he is being asked to accept dogmatic teaching from such a Source that it would be wicked to gainsay it. But what of those whose attitude is not quite the same as that of the author? What, for instance, will it mean to those who hesitate to accept the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption to have the question decided for them thus, in a message addressed to those who hesitate?

> "Neither the moral corruption of birth,
> Nor the material corruption of death,
> Could have dominion over the precious Body
> Which Mary bore."

But there is much in the book that is beautiful, if we can put ourselves in line with its combination of devotion and dogmatism. The language is seldom lacking in the dignity and simplicity that are demanded, and it is only to be expected that now and then it is too philosophic, as in the saying, "Substance is not quantity, but essence: that which maketh specific being"; or too modern, as in the conclusion about healing, that "Faith will remove mountains, for suggestion is the Fount of Power."

T. W. CRAFER.

ST. GREGORY THE GREAT. By Pierre Batiffol; translated by John L. Stodart. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

It is rare to find, as here, the biography of a saint which is readable and yet scholarly, far beyond its size and price. Far too often the smaller lives are uncritical eulogies, beneath the average standard of intelligence, and quite unhistorical. Mons. Batiffol's work is that of a scholar, but written in such a way as to be popular, yet without the usual faults of that style. The very full references are placed at the end of each chapter, so that they do not worry the unlearned reader. It is an especially useful book for English readers, not only because St. Gregory was the Pope who sent the Italian Mission to England, but because the best English account of him is a massive work in two large volumes by F. H. Dutton, which many have not the time for, although they have the interest.

The translation is surprisingly good. But a certain use of the historic future and a very liberal powdering of exclamation marks, which are both legitimate in French, are irritating in a style which otherwise reads like an original.

V. I. RUFFER.

THE ADVENTURE OF YOUTH. By Arthur K. Yapp. Longmans. 4s. net (paper 2s. 6d.).

Sir Arthur Yapp has used material largely worked up from articles contributed to papers as widely different as the *Daily Telegraph* and *Tit-Bits* (the total number of papers is eighteen) to write this little book. The miscellaneous result is very imperfectly concealed by the device of trying to bring all under the chosen title. Much the best part of the book is Part IV., which gives a good account of the past and present efforts and aspirations of the Y.M.C.A. It is surely a mistake to write the same book for Youth and for Youth's elders: young people are not going to profit by hearing their supposed characteristics, needs, or excellences discussed. And as for that part of the book more precisely addressed to Youth, it is doubtful whether the dialectic and moralizing manner chosen is likely to be successful, or on the other hand the frequent elaborate "Sports" metaphors.

A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON.

LETTERS TO A DOUBTER. By Paul Claudel; translated by Henry Longan Stuart. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s.

The title of this book ignores an important part of its claim on attention; it suggests a monologue when we are given conversation, and the letters of Paul Claudel owe much of their interest to the outpourings of Jacques Rivière which evoked them. It has been said of Claudel that the greatest of his gifts is his power of influence; with Rivière as the subject for its exercise, we are here shown this power in action, but it is

the disciple rather than the master with whom we are most concerned. Claudel must be a familiar name to very many who know nothing of Rivière, and these letters, admirable as they are, add little to our knowledge of him. They are in conformity with his reputation as a literary artist and a devoted Catholic whose highest ambition is to succeed in winning souls, and it is from Rivière that we get a clue to the problem of his influence on the questioning and lawless mind of youth. A chance reference to Rimbaud opens the door to the field of interest where he can be met. Claudel the artist acknowledges Rimbaud as his master, and their connection makes obvious appeal to imaginations attracted by extremes. By sharing their admiration for "the great terrible poet" he comes in touch with a young generation who are very far away from his own orthodox beliefs or rules of conduct, and once he has established contact he shows himself an adept in his use of it. Rivière, the leader of a group, when he tells him that he "tames a language by his genius," suggests the enthusiasm of his admirers.

The book would be valuable if only for the spiritual drama we can gather from its pages. We realize Jacques Rivière, student at Bordeaux, falling more and more under the spell of Claudel as thinker and as stylist. At last he decides to write to him. The first two letters show us a youth of keen intelligence, restless with a hunger of the mind that nothing satisfies. He oscillates between melancholy and exaltation. He is for ever watching himself. He weighs and appraises the quality of his scepticism even while he seeks for faith. Claudel (who holds a Government appointment in China) makes warm response; it becomes clear at once that he senses a possible victory for the Faith and will spare no pains that will help to secure it. Later on, when he knows him better, Rivière makes a deliberate study of his master's message to his contemporaries, and declares "he is not endeavouring to alter opinion; what he claims is a soul that he may offer it to God."

This indeed is the impression the letters convey, and the conquest of Rivière proved a difficult task even for Claudel. The assault is renewed year after year, despite many discouragements and rebuffs, and at length the victory is won. Christmas, 1913, saw Jacques Rivière once more within the fold of the Catholic Church.

The correspondence ends at this point, but we are given a summary of the sequel. Rivière, against the advice of his mentor, had exchanged his prospects at the University for a literary career. In normal times he might have justified himself, but his venture was interrupted by the war. He spent four years in a German prison, and during that period the Faith as inculcated by Claudel was his chief solace, and he wrote the book, *A la Trace de Dieu*, which has recently appeared.

The war broke his career and wrecked his health. After his return to France he had no longer strength sufficient for the struggle that circumstances demanded of him. In 1925 he died. During those last years he did not make open profession or practice of the Faith, and he seems to have continued to be subject to many intellectual influences, although never completely overmastered by one in particular. We find the suggestions of André Gide very evident in his early Letters, and Gide had his place also in the post-war period. There were many others; Maurice Barres was among them and, one must surmise, Marcel Proust. And so Paul Claudel had slipped out of his reach, separated by more then separation of space. Yet in the end the message of Claudel—the

very antithesis to that of Proust—silenced the rest. The Doubter ceased to doubt, and before death came had found joy and peace in his belief.

The book should claim the attention even of those who do not spare much time to the literature of modern France, it contains so vivid a picture of mental conflict in a mind ruled by the desire for complete sincerity. The translator has done his work admirably.

E. K. SANDERS.

HYMNS OF THE ALVARS. By J. S. M. Hooper. Humphrey Milford. 3s.

This addition to the Heritage of India Series is an able piece of work by the Principal of Wesley College, Madras. It contains a general introduction which explains the place and importance of these fervent poets of Southern India in the development of the *bhakti* movement—Mr. Hooper assigns the earliest of them to the middle of the seventh century of the Christian era—it provides translations of a number of their hymns, each with its own introduction and notes, and it has some good illustrations. The characteristic note of yearning for God finds repeated expression in erotic verse which easily offends the reader who is innocent of spiritual passion and unaccustomed to excessive symbolism, but the yearning is plainly authentic, and it is sometimes wide-eyed in its vision. Thus Nammalvar sings:

> "Many a different way of worshipping
> And many clashing creeds from different minds,
> And in the many creeds their many gods
> Thou'st made, spreading abroad thy form! O thou
> Matchless, I will proclaim my *love* for thee!"

O. HARDMAN.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES. By C. A. Alington, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 5s. (3s. 6d. in paper covers).

The Maddisons, Jim and Mary, are fortunate in the possession of a friend who is not only a convinced and well-informed Christian, but a man of good-humoured common sense and a ready perception of the weak points in the logical armour of the unbelieving and provocative Jim. They talk, they argue, and they write letters. The subjects discussed are the familiar "doubts and difficulties" concerning Christian evidences, the value of the Scriptures and the Creeds, miracles, science versus religion, life after death, the inconsistency of professing Christians, the good of church-going, the relations between Church and State, and so on. At the end of it all Jim is left confessing that he is beginning to regard Mary herself as the strongest argument for Christianity, but he has plainly been hit by some of his friend's shafts; and so no doubt will all the Jim Maddisons who give themselves the pleasure of reading this book.

O. HARDMAN.

RENEWAL OF LIFE IN THE CLERGY. By David Jenks, S.S.M. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

The Church of England, since the war, has completely revised its constitution with a thorough-going adaptation to the fundamentally liberty-loving English character. It has made a complete survey of its world-wide missionary obligations and opportunities. But these great tasks which have been accomplished, while they make wise and full provision

for the unimpeded flow of spiritual life and influence, do not in themselves generate that life and influence. In response to the Pastoral Letter of the Archbishops the Church of England now addresses herself to the rethinking of God and the renewal of her spiritual life.

Father Jenks draws attention to the subtle danger of the multiplication by clergy of their parochial activities in a hardly conscious attempt to justify their spiritual ineffectiveness. Have we not all felt that pathetic pride in being busy, that fever of activity, which robs us of the repose of spirit, the inner calmness, the spirit of prayer, without which no work of ours is fulfilled before our God?

He asks his brother clergy to propound to themselves the question: "Why do I read the Bible?" Is it for suitable texts, for sermon subjects? Or is it for living water and for the light of life? Seeing that diverse interpretations of Holy Communion have estranged devoted members of the same Church and disciples of the same Master from one another, he pleads for the utmost mutual respect for each other's interpretations. He reminds us of the true objective of the Church Militant. He deplores theological civil war which expends much of its pugnacity on internecine warfare. In the chapter "Beyond Prayer" he deals sympathetically and effectively with the practice of the presence of God. In the last chapter, "Ourselves," he recalls himself and his brother clergy to the significance of Ordination Vows and of the grace of Holy Orders. He ends with useful appendices.

H. Lovell Clarke.

Diocesis Cantuariensis: Registrum Mathei Parker. Pars Octava. Canterbury and York Society. Part LXXXIII.

The appearance of the eighth part of Archbishop Parker's Register is particularly welcome, not merely because it completes the first and larger volume, but also because it contains Dr. Frere's Introduction. This Register, when completed by the issue of the second volume, combined with Wolsey's, which has already been issued, and with Gardiner's, to be issued next year, will form a valuable trilogy of Tudor ecclesiastical records. Apart from the Introduction, this portion of the Register contains little that is novel or of exceptional value. Most of it is in "common form," so that the Editor has been able to condense his material considerably by references to preceding pages. There are, however, some documents printed in this part which will be of interest to many who are not particularly concerned either with Parker's career or the records of his administration. One series illustrates the necessary formalities for obtaining a pension from a benefice and reveals the care taken to obtain the consent of each party concerned. Another set of documents is concerned with the union of two benefices and contains the assent of two parishioners in English, one from each parish. The cause assigned is that the "parrishe Churche of Woodlande . . . yo become so mynous and in decaye." A different series deals with the nomination to the office of Warden of Merton College and with the Process of Election of the Warden of All Souls.

The Introduction deals succinctly but comprehensively with the contents of the Register, and draws attention to the significance of many documents which might escape attention. It has a useful section describing the various Archiepiscopal courts and a full account of the Archbishop's officials.

C. J. Offer.

THE MEDIÆVAL INQUISITION. By Jean Guiraud. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s.

It is always possible to offer an apologia on behalf of an institution, and as this is the age of whitewashing, there is no reason why M. Guiraud should not put forth his defence of the Inquisition. In the brief compass of some two hundred pages he covers Catharism in the twelfth century, the establishment of this dread tribunal, its functioning, its work in France and the rest of Christendom in the thirteenth century (which means the cases of the Cathari and the Waldenses), and its work in the fourteenth century (which means its relations with the Spirituals, the Beghards, the Lollards, the Jews and sorcerers). The author remembers the long-continued and sweeping process by which responsibilities, once purely episcopal, became papal, or at any rate centralized. Without some idea of it it is very difficult to understand why England, for instance, never had an Inquisition of its own, and therefore placed larger powers with the State and heavy responsibilities upon the Bishop. Here the mediæval history the author outlines explains later developments. The procedure is described clearly, although the trials are sometimes hard to follow, mainly because of the presumption of guilt, and the handling of the evidence, even without the horrors of torture, is strange to the modern mind. To read the trials is for a time to move in an unnatural world. The morbid pathology of civil history is an unpleasing study; that of ecclesiastical and religious history is almost a nightmare in which high ideals and evil practice mingle in a very dance of death.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

HUMANISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By Francis John McConnell, Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1928. 7s. 6d. net.

This book contains a series of lectures delivered at the Newton Theological Institution in America. The general subject is the value of human life in the light of Christianity. The book is a good example of the type of popular American theology familiar to us in this country through the writings of such a teacher as Dr. Fosdick. Without being profound or markedly original, it gives a fresh and vigorous statement of Christian moral principles. It would provide good material for sermons. Our only criticism of the volume is that the price seems excessive for a work of only some 150 pages.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. By F. S. M. Bennett, Dean of Chester. Chapman and Hall. 5s.

An extraordinarily arresting and suggestive book. The Dean tells us that he had intended to call it "Conditional Immortality with Organic Resurrection," a title which would have well described the thesis he maintains. He urges (with Gladstone) that the idea of the natural immortality of the soul does not belong to original Christianity, and that the teaching of our Lord and His apostles neither assumed nor inculcated any such doctrine. The Christian hope is Resurrection, for those whom our Lord has made capable of it. "Eternal fire" means destruction, not torture. Thus alone, the Dean maintains, is it possible to reconcile the goodness of God with our Lord's words on the fewness of the saved. The idea of natural immortality begins with Origen; but with him its natural corollary

is universalism. This is inconsistent with our Lord's teaching and with the seriousness of life. It was St. Augustine who more than anyone else fastened upon the Church the idea of everlasting torment; but, in fact, the first official condemnation of the denial of natural immortality was a bull of Leo X. in A.D. 1513. What, then, of the souls of the dead before their resurrection? If they are salvable they are to be thought of as "clothed upon," not yet with their own bodies, but with the ascended and universalized Body of Christ, in whom they consciously sleep as the germ-cell within the body of its mother. The book concludes with a brilliant exegesis of 1 Cor. XV.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

BOOK NOTES

Little Plays of Saint Benedict. Blackwell. 5s. The sub-title, "A Pax Book," tells the initiated that the anonymous author is a Benedictine nun. Perhaps we may be allowed to add that she was known in the world as one of our best mediævalists. The plays are very simple and charming. Children would love to act them. The ordinary parish at its present stage of development would probably fail to appreciate them. Those whose ideas of mediævalism have been nourished on *The Forest Lovers* will find them tame. But there should be enough people of discrimination to encourage Sister —— to give us more in this vein.

The Anglican Tradition: A Discussion of Eucharistic Doctrine. By S. C. Carpenter. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. Our reviews are written for the most part by very busy men who give their services gratuitously. Sometimes it happens that the reviewers return books, being unable to find time to fulfil their promises. This explains why the present notice is nearly two years late. An apology is due to Canon Carpenter for the delay. His book already seems to refer in a measure to past history, so quickly do events move. Not Eucharistic doctrine but the Catholic conception of the Ministry is in the forefront of controversy just now. Nevertheless, it would be a pity if this book were passed over. The writer, living at close quarters with Lancashire Protestantism, is specially well qualified to write an eirenicon setting forth Eucharistic doctrine in a simple and persuasive way for those whom obstinate inherited prejudices prevent from seeing the beauty and reasonableness of the Church's faith. Many a good sermon on the Eucharist could be preached with the help of the material here provided.

The Faith of an English Churchman. By Albert Mitchell. Longmans. 2s. 6d. A beautifully written and almost wholly positive statement of "the things commonly believed amongst us," by an eminent Evangelical lay Churchman. Such books make for peace. An Anglo-Catholic could not subscribe to all herein contained; but his dominant feeling on concluding the book would be joy to think that in God's providence, in spite of the divisions of Christendom, he was allowed to be in communion with the author.

God's Plan. By Michael Furse, Bishop of St. Albans. S.C.M. 4s. This brief sketch of the Christian faith and life has grown out of addresses given to scoutmasters. In manner it is reminiscent of well-known books by Bishop Carey. It would be admirable for lending to laymen, or as a basis for a course of addresses.

The Perplexities of the Plain Man. By F. Biggart, M.A. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. Father Biggart's Margaret Street Lectures, dealing mainly with

the problem of authority, are now published. The two on the Authority of the Holy See, and Authority in the Church of England, are especially useful. W. K. L. C.

The Heavenly Priesthood of Our Lord. A review of the Bible Doctrine, with special reference to recent developments in Teaching and Ritual. By W. L. Paige Cox. Blackwell. 1s. A criticism of the teaching that our Lord is offering a continuous sacrifice in heaven, and of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice treated as a corollary of that teaching. The Archdeacon is specially concerned to criticize Dr. Gayford's exegesis in the *New Commentary* of the relevant passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is perhaps worth noting that the oblationary aspect of the Eucharist does not really depend on any particular theory of the nature of the Priesthood of our Lord, and appears to be compatible with three such theories at least.

The Women of the Gospel. By A. Christitch. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d. The purpose of the book is to note the attitude of women to our Lord as set forth in the Gospels, and to draw attention to the fact that none of them passed from His presence without an act of faith. It is a slight but straightforward piece of work with regard to which we can only echo very sincerely the censor's verdict of *nihil obstat.*

For Middle-Class Christians. By Harold B. Shepheard, M.A. George Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d. Here is something to stir the conscience of those to whom it is addressed. Is our attitude to business and politics anything like that of our Lord? The answer is negative and devastating. Mr. Shepheard's beautiful unworldliness and literary simplicity are in the finest tradition of the Society of Friends; and we should certainly have believed him a Quaker if his publishers had not gone out of their way to undeceive us. K. D. M.

The Story of Blessed John Fisher. By N. M. Wilby. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 3s. 6d. This small book is a well-written account of the life of the famous Bishop of Rochester, the friend and confessor of the Lady Margaret, mother of Henry VII. As a patron of the New Learning, England, and not least his own University, owes him a heavy debt for the work which he initiated and directed. It was at his invitation, it should never be forgotten, that Erasmus went to Cambridge. His last days were unhappy, owing to the quarrel between Henry VIII. and the Papal Court, and in the end, as is well known, together with his friend Thomas More, he gave his life for his convictions.

Sketches of Church History. By J. C. Robertson. (Revised by C. B. Moss.) S.P.C.K. Parts I. and II., 2s. 6d., or in one volume 5s. This famous book was first published in 1878. In the revised edition it is well adapted to the use of study circles; the growing class of layman who desires a simple statement of the history of the Church should also find it attractive. The first part deals with the period from the age of the Apostles to A.D. 604; the second part brings the story down to the Reformation. The revision has been limited to bringing the history into line with recent research and to the introduction of more modern phraseology. In a few places new matter has been introduced.

L. E. B.

The Spirit of Charity. By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d. This little treatise on Love is intended primarily for Lenten reading. Lent and Love, says the writer, are closely con-

nected. The most perfect practice for Lent is that of Charity. Though written by a Jesuit, the book is non-controversial. All who are trying to love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity will find in it very much that is helpful. It is at once philosophical and practical, mystical and yet full of that saving common sense which is often found in Jesuit writings.

The Starting Place of Prayer. By A. C. Sherwood. Heffer, Cambridge. 3s. 6d. This book is an *apologia pro vita sua*—a narrative of personal experience by a Nonconformist. Mrs. Sherwood describes the doubts and difficulties which drove her for a time into a "spiritual no-man's land." She tells how she regained Faith and a deepened conviction of the love of God in Christ. Her creed, she says, is "best expressed in the terms of an age-old affirmation" (*i.e.*, the Apostles' Creed). The book is attractive because of its candour and its transparent honesty.

The House of my Pilgrimage. By Dom Anselm Hughes, O.S.B. The Faith Press. 2s. This work, by an Anglican Benedictine, is a commentary on Hebrew vi. 1-2. The writer takes the foundation doctrines—Repentance, Faith, Baptism, Laying on of Hands, Resurrection, and Eternal Judgment—as the subject of his six chapters. These foundation doctrines "fall into three pairs: conversion, the sacramental life, and the life in heavenly places," corresponding with the division of the Spiritual Way into Purgation, Illumination, and Union. The book is written in an arresting and original style, and is clearly the outcome of the author's own spiritual experience. H. W. F.

Mount Zion. By Gwendolen Green. J. M. Dent. 7s. 6d. Miss Plunket Green is a niece of Baron Von Hügel, to whom she acknowledges her indebtedness. A strong sense of poetic mysticism pervades the book. Her phrase "the inexhaustible wonder and beauty of God" and the chapter heading "Out of Zion hath God appeared in perfect beauty" sound the keynote. She left the Church of England for the Roman Church on the ground that the former had long neglected the æsthetic and mystical aspects of religion.

The Romance of Marriage. By Canon Spencer H. Elliott. S.P.C.K. 1s. A wise little book, which deals with the real difficulties of the sex-relationship, with the real attitude and temper of the present day towards sex, with the teachings of a free self-expression, with the implications of the reasoning of Freud, with the increase of divorce, with the practice of birth-control, not in the spirit of a bitter antagonism, but with a sympathetic understanding which, nevertheless, shows the more excellent way.

Flowers and Trees of Palestine. By Augusta A. Temple. S.P.C.K. 6s. A handbook for the flower-lover travelling in Palestine. The early part of the book identifies and describes the flowers and trees mentioned in the Bible. The second and larger part gives a complete descriptive alphabetical list of all the flowers and trees found in Palestine.

Sermons and Lectures. By Canon E. R. Bernard. Cambridge University Press. 6s. Selections from the writings left at his death. They manifest the simplicity and lucidity of a scholar who does not strive after effect, but weighs his words with accuracy and makes his statements with precision. Æsthetic appreciation, deep religious conviction, and a shy sympathy are evidenced, but not paraded. The longest series is a course of lectures on hymns and hymn-writers. H. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER